IDEOLOGY OF PAKISTAN

JAVID IQBAL

ARMY OFFICERS BOOK CLUB
WINTER ISSUE, 1978.

Ideology of Pakistan

Javid Iqbal

Ferozsons Ltd.

KARACHI — HYDERABAD — LAHORE — MANGLA
RAWALPINDI — PESHAWAR

Printed by A. Hameed Khan,
at Ferozsons Ltd., 32, Shara-i-
Al-Shaikh Abdul Hamid Bin
Badees, Lahore.

i. Second edition printed by M/s Noor Alam Printers
3-A Cooper Road, Lahore,
on behalf of National Book Foundation, Islamabad
ii. Code No. **TBRP/P—252/NBF/578/My/2000.**
iii. For Sale and use in Pakistan.

TO

THE PEOPLE OF PAKISTAN

PROLOGUE

This book was originally written in answer to a number of questions relating to the Ideology of Pakistan. Now it is recast, revised and reprinted with the addition of several new chapters. These questions were: What is the Ideology of Pakistan? What kind of socio-economic order the Ideology aspires to establish? How should the State be brought in conformity with the Ideology? What are the duties of the State and those of the individual to the State in terms of the Ideology? What is the significance of Fundamental Rights according to the Ideology? What does the Ideology recommend for realising the ideals of national solidarity and territorial integrity of Pakistan? What constitutes an ideal citizen in the context of the Ideology? How the offensive of Hinduism against the Ideology can be combated? How can the goal of complete self-reliance or self-sufficiency be secured through Alignment and Bilateralism?

Obviously Pakistan is an ideological State and can, therefore, survive only so long as its ideological integrity is maintained. It is this Ideology which is the foundation of the concept of our nationhood, and is the source of our national, political, economic, cultural, religious and moral values or ideals and their expression.

This book attempts to rationalise the Ideology or our distinct way of life. It assists in securing an understanding of the powerful vision which inspired the Muslim revivalists of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and led to the establishment of Pakistan. It also demonstrates what this vision might mean in practical terms in the life of the nation today, and shows how the modern concepts of Nationalism, Patriotism, Secularism, Constitutionalism and Socialism are interpreted in terms of our Ideology.

The generation of educated Muslims involved in the struggle for Pakistan, was conscious that the Ideology which unified the scattered Muslims of the Indian sub-continent and goaded them on to securing Pakistan, was founded on a viewpoint of Islam as a broad, liberal,

assimilative and dynamic way of life, which acknowledged change and had the capability of responding meaningfully to altered conditions of modern life. This was the reason why, during the course of its struggle for Pakistan, that generation fought against and defeated (besides Hinduism) such internal anti-ideological forces like Puritanism, Regionalism and Socialism. But after the establishment of Pakistan and particularly since the death of Quaid-i-Azam, only lip service was rendered to the Ideology. No one seriously cared to enforce it in the spheres of Education, Economic Planning, Information or Politics. The ideologically committed Muslim intellectuals of the older generation, who were absorbed in the government at the early stages, also failed to make any positive contribution in this respect. They were either ignored or felt obliged to take sides in the power-struggle or personal feuds of the politicians. The result is that the anti-ideological forces which were vanquished at the time of the creation of Pakistan, regained strength and threatened to dissolve Pakistan.

Puritanism in Islam is reluctant to accept change and has a fixed attitude towards altered conditions of modern life. It is romantic, essentially backward looking and a menace only when it embarks on disseminating sectarian antagonism. But Regionalism and Socialism have always been inter-dependent in this country as both thrive on provincial and class hatred. All of us know that these schismatic creeds almost succeeded in breaking up the national unity and territorial integrity of Pakistan.

This book comes at a time when all Pakistanis have been faced by the disillusioning events of their recent historical experience to reconsider and re-evaluate themselves, and to try to discover what direction they should take in reconstructing their national unity and territorial integrity. It should be of interest to every Pakistani who is concerned about the future of Pakistan.

This book was first published in 1959 and provoked favourable as well as critical response from eminent national as well as international Islamicists, orientalists, thinkers, educationists and political leaders. Some of these opinions or comments suggested valuable modifications and improvements of the ideas expressed in this book. However, a selection of these opinions is incorporated under the

Epilogue in order to encourage further thought. This international forum of discussion, includes the views of Reuben Levy, A.J. Arberry, Louis Massignon, A. Bausani, Annemarie Schimmel, Freeland Abbott, K.G. Saiyidain, Muhammad Ayub Khan, Jawaharlal Nehru, *Tar-Jumanul Quran* edited by Syed Abul Ala Maudoodi, *Faran* edited by Maherul Qadri, and *the Muslim World* (a Christian Missionary critique on Islam).

Many others also expressed their views on this book which are perhaps not of much significance. But I was most intrigued by the comments of an eminent Pakistani educationist who maintained that I have presented Islam as a grim and rigid doctrine, and this was so because of my concept of the nature of God.

I firmly believe that our plans for the future of Pakistan must be founded on our understanding of the nature of God. Should the God of Islam be considered vigorous, virile, violent and righteous? Everywhere in the Western world the complacent well-to-do (the bourgeois) think of God as gentle and forgiving, obviously because a meek, submissive, docile and soft God does not trouble the conscience. But if God is really righteous, then we, like the early Muslims, must tremble in anticipation of His wrath against our corruption, hypocrisy, injustice and lack of brotherhood.

The sources of references or quotations on which reliance has been placed are given chapterwise under the Notes at the end.

This book is not intended to be the last word. Its glance is focused inwards in order to stimulate activity. It claims only to suggest means for the realisation of certain definite ends.

JAVID IQBAL

Epilogue in order to encourage further thought. This international forum of discussion, includes the views of Reuben Levy, A.J. Arberry, Louis Massignon, A. Bausani, Annemarie Schimmel, Freeland Abbott, K.G. Saiyidain, Muhammed Ayub Khan, Jawaharlal Nehru, *Tarjumanul Quran* edited by Syed Abul Ala Maudoodi, *Fanus* edited by Maherul Qadri, and the *Muslim World* (a Christian Missionary critique on Islam).

Many others also expressed their views on this book which are perhaps not of much significance. But I was most intrigued by the comments of an eminent Pakistani educationist who maintained that I have presented Islam as a grim and rigid doctrine, and this was so because of my concept of the nature of God.

I firmly believe that our plans for the future of Pakistan must be founded on our understanding of the nature of God. Should the God of Islam be considered vigorous, virile, violent and righteous? Everywhere in the Western world the complacent well-to-do (the bourgeois) think of God as gentle and forgiving, obviously because a meek, submissive, docile and soft God does not trouble the conscience. But if God is really righteous, then we, like the early Muslims, must tremble in anticipation of His wrath against our corruption, hypocrisy, injustice and lack of brotherhood.

The sources of references or quotations on which reliance has been placed are given chapterwise under the Notes at the end.

This book is not intended to be the last word. Its glance is focused inwards in order to stimulate activity. It claims only to suggest means for the realisation of certain definite ends.

JAVID IQBAL

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

IDEOLOGY — RESTATED

The Ideology of a nation always reflects the state of a people's mind, their emotions, hopes, aspirations, ideals or objectives and a subsisting will to realise them. The worth of any Ideology depends on the extent of a people's dedication to it and not on its rational or scientific demonstration. Therefore, it is not logic but sympathy that is required for properly understanding the Ideology of any people.

Pakistan claims itself to be an ideological state because it is founded on Islam. It came into being because Muslims of the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent developed a specific attitude of mind—an attitude which was determined by a consciousness of certain principles or objectives which they felt must be realised.

It is obvious that the people of Pakistan descend from different racial stock, speak different languages and live in geographically non-contiguous territories. The foundation of this State, therefore, could not possibly be laid on such principles as common race, common language and contiguousness of territory. On these principles there exist numerous groups of people such as Bengalis, Punjabis, Sindhis, Pathans and Baluchis within Pakistan. The requirements of what is called 'Nationalism' in the West are matters in Pakistan merely of sympathetically understanding regional aspirations and equitably adjusting the demands for regional autonomy in accordance with the will of the people of several units constituting the federated centre. The real factor which sustains the State of Pakistan is the existence of a consciousness among the people of belonging to each other because a large majority of them adheres to a common spiritual aspiration, i.e. faith in Islam. It is for this reason that Quaid-i-Azam proclaimed at a public meeting in Dacca held on 21st March, 1948: 1*

"Islam has taught us this and, I think, you will agree with me, for whatever else you may be and whatever you are,

*Notes are appended at the end.

you are a Muslim. You belong to a nation now: You have carved out a territory, vast territory, it is all yours; it does not belong to a Punjabi, or a Sindhi, or a Pathan, or a Bengali; it is yours."

Consequently the basis of nationhood in Pakistan is Islam. Islam acted as a nation-building force long before the establishment of Pakistan. Muslims gradually developed a national consciousness in the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent, they collectively struggled for the right of self-determination and the establishment of an independent homeland to be carved out from those territories where they constituted majorities. They eventually secured what they wanted. Hence the historical fact which could not be denied is that the formation of the Muslim nation preceded the demand for a homeland. Pakistan by herself did not give birth to any nation; on the contrary, the Muslim nation struggled for and brought Pakistan into being. Therefore, Pakistan is not the cause of any kind of nationhood. She is only an effect, a result or a fruit of the struggle of the Muslim nation for territorial specification.

Of course we may now claim ourselves to be Pakistanis or belonging to the Pakistani nation but, strictly speaking, this is only for the purpose of distinction or identification among other nations of the world. Pakistani nationhood is not the real basis for the unity of the state in Pakistan; it is merely an apparent basis. At the present stage of our development as a nation it is not a primary but only a secondary consideration; the primary being Islam, which cements us as a nation and also provides the basis for the unity of the State.

The same can be said respecting Patriotism, i.e. laying down one's life for one's country. Muslims do not have a notion of Pakistan as 'fatherland' or 'motherland'. They do not believe in worshipping the geographical features of a country called Pakistan. They are not prepared to lay down their lives merely for Pakistan's dust, trees, deserts, mountains or rivers. This form of Patriotism, according to them, is idolatrous. But in their native soil, Muslims are ready and willing to lay down their lives for the religio-cultural principles on which the State of Pakistan is founded. Quaid-i-Azam clearly illustrated these principles when he addressed the Officers and Men of

the 5th Heavy Ack Ack and 6th Light Ack Ack Regiments in Malir on 21st February, 1948:[2]

> "Now you have to stand guard over the development and maintenance of Islamic democracy, Islamic social justice and the equality of man in your own native soil. You will have to be alert, very alert, for the time for relaxation is not yet there."

Quaid-i-Azam was dedicated to the ideals of liberty and freedom. These ideals had precedence over everything else. Therefore, he was a firm believer in strong defence which he regarded as a bulwark against aggression and, therefore, a service to the cause of peace. Addressing the Establishment of H.M.P.S. 'Dilawar' on 23rd January, 1948, he said:[3]

> "While giving the fullest support to the principles of the United Nations Charter, we cannot afford to neglect our defence. However strong the United Nations Organisation might be, the primary responsibility for the defence of our country will rest with us and Pakistan must be prepared for all eventualities and dangers. The weak and defenceless, in this imperfect world, invite aggression from others. The best way in which we can serve the cause of peace is by removing the temptation from the path of those who think that we are weak, and therefore, they can bully or attack us. That temptation can only be removed if we make ourselves so strong that nobody dare entertain any aggressive designs against us. You will have to make up for the smallness of your size by your courage and selfless devotion to duty, for it is not life that matters but the courage and determination you bring to it."

Hence the first principle of the Ideology of Pakistan as laid down by Quaid-i-Azam is that for Pakistanis, Islam is the basis of their 'Nationalism' as well as 'Patriotism'.

Pakistan is an ideological state for it claims itself to be Islamic. It is not a 'theocratic' State because Islam is essentially a polity and aspires to create a civil society. This point was explained by

Quaid-i-Azam in his broadcast recorded on 19th February, 1948 when he proclaimed:[4]

> "Make no mistake: Pakistan is not a theocracy or anything like it. Islam demands from us the tolerance of other creeds and we welcome in closest association with us all those who, of whatever creed, are themselves willing and ready to play their part as true and loyal citizens of Pakistan."

Islam does not recognise the distinction between the 'spiritual' and the 'profane'. According to Islam the spiritual and temporal obligations are not only connected with each other but it is incumbent on every Muslim to constantly endeavour to realise the spiritual values while performing his temporal obligations. Hence 'Secularism' is an integral part of Islam and it is for this reason that the Islamic State assimilates the qualities of an ideal 'Secular State'.

In the positive sense a 'Secular State' means a State which guarantees religious freedom to every citizen and which, without distinction of religion or race, endeavours to promote the material advancement and welfare of all its citizens. The Islamic State of Pakistan, as envisaged by Quaid-i-Azam, embraces the qualities of an ideal 'Secular State'. In this State every citizen is granted the right of religious freedom. Sunnis, Shias, Wahabis and other sects of Islam, Hindus, Christians, Parsis, Buddhists and their numerous sects are free to profess their respective personal faiths and be governed by their respective personal codes of law. Islamic theology recognises a distinction of meanings in the words 'Mazhab' and 'Din'. 'Mazhab' means personal faith, viewpoint or path; whereas 'Din' means a body of those universal principles of Islam which are applicable to the entire humanity. Therefore, in this sense, the State of Pakistan does not have any specific 'Mazhab' because it is neither founded on nor projects the personal viewpoint of any particular Islamic sect, but like an ideal 'Secular State', to promote the material advancement and welfare of all its citizens without distinction of religion or race, is one of its numerous duties. Thus, in the political sense, irrespective of their religion or race, all Pakistanis are citizens of the State of Pakistan on equal terms. This very important aspect of the State of Pakistan was clarified by Quaid-i-Azam in his famous presidential address to the Constituent Assembly on 11th August, 1947, when he proclaimed:[5]

"You are free; you are free to go to your temples, you are free to go to your mosques or to any other place of worship in this State of Pakistan. You may belong to any religion, or caste or creed—that has nothing to do with the business of the State .... We are starting with this fundamental principle that we are all citizens and equal citizens of one State....Now, I think, we should keep that in front of us as our ideal and you will find that in the course of time Hindus would cease to be Hindus and Muslims would cease to be Muslims, not in the religious sense, because that is the personal faith of each individual, but in the political sense as citizens of the State."

The State of Pakistan claims itself to be Islamic firstly, because it is founded on Islam as 'Din' (as distinguished from 'Mazhab'), a body of Islamic principles which are for universal application. These principles are: That sovereignty belongs to God alone and the authority which He has delegated to the State of Pakistan through its people is to be exercised within the limits prescribed by Him; that the authority delegated to the State is a sacred trust; that the State must endeavour to achieve the ideals of equality, solidarity, freedom and justice among all its citizens; that its constitution must be democratic, for it must exercise its powers and authority through the chosen representatives of the people; that it must guarantee man's inalienable and fundamental rights, e.g., equality of status and of opportunity, equality before law, freedom of thought, expression, belief, faith, worship, association, assembly, movement, trade, business or profession, and the right to hold and dispose of property, subject to law and public morality; that it must secure the complete independence of the Judiciary and uphold the supremacy of rule of law. Each of these principles can be directly traced from the Quran and Sunnah. The following statements of Quaid-i-Azam reiterate the very same principles:

"It is my belief that our salvation lies in following the golden rules of conduct set for us by our great law-giver, the Prophet of Islam. Let us lay the foundations of our democracy on the basis of truly Islamic ideals and principles. Our Almighty has taught us that our decisions in the affairs of the State shall be guided by discussions and consultations". (Speech: Sibbi Durbar, 14th February, 1948).[6]

"Brotherhood, equality and fraternity of man—these are all the basic points of our religion, culture and civilisation. And we fought for Pakistan because there was a danger of denial of these human rights in this sub-continent." (Speech: Chittagong, 26th March, 1948).[7]

"The theory of Pakistan guarantees that federated units of the National Government would have all the autonomy that you will find in the constitutions of the United States of America, Canada and Australia. But certain vital powers will remain vested in the Central Government such as the monetary system, national defence and other federal responsibilities. Each federal state or province would have its own legislative, executive and judicial systems, each of the three branches of Government being constitutionally separate." (Interview: Associated Press of America, 8th November, 1945).[8]

"The Constitution of Pakistan has yet to be framed by the Pakistan Constituent Assembly. I do not know what the ultimate shape of this Constitution is going to be, but I am sure that it will be a democratic type, embodying the essential principles of Islam. Today they are as applicable in actual life as they were 1300 years ago. Islam and its idealism have taught us democracy. It has taught equality of man, justice and fair-play to everybody. We are the inheritors of these glorious traditions and are fully alive to our responsibilities and obligations as framers of the future Constitution of Pakistan." (Recorded broadcast, February, 1948).[9]

Secondly, the State of Pakistan is Islamic for the reason that although it is committed to promote the material advancement and welfare of all its citizens like an ideal 'Secular State', it is also its duty to endeavour to promote the moral and spiritual advancement and welfare of its Muslim citizens. This does not in any way imply that there are grades or classes of citizenship in Pakistan. For all practical purposes such conditions do not exist. Since Muslims constitute a large majority, they have the right to demand that constitutionally the head of the State of Pakistan must belong to the majority community. (Even this is merely symbolic for in a federal parliamentary form of democracy, as envisaged by Quaid-i-Azam, the real power vests in the

party which commands majority in the Assembly). Similarly, they have the right to demand that the State must promulgate such laws and implement such educational system for their children which promoted (besides the material advancement and welfare of all its citizens) the moral and spiritual advancement and welfare of its Muslim citizens so that Muslims are enabled to order their lives in the individual and collective spheres in accordance with the teachings and requirements of Islam as set out in the Quran and Sunnah. This is also necessary for the preservation of the Ideology on which Pakistan is founded.

Consequently, the second principle of the Ideology of Pakistan as laid down by Quaid-i-Azam is that for Pakistanis Islam is the basis of their 'Secularism' as well as 'Constitutionalism.'

Islam has its own economic system. Muslims believe that each generation, guided but unhampered by the work of its predecessors, can interpret the Quran according to its needs and requirements. The object of Islam is to establish a balanced economic order based on fundamental human rights which ensures that no individual can exploit another. It rejects Capitalism and Communism as two extremist viewpoints and bases its own economic system on the principles of 'moderation', i.e. *Iqtisad*—the maintenance of a correct balance between labour and capital. Therefore, it acknowledges the fundamental human right of 'private ownership' with the proviso that any individual cannot accumulate so much wealth that it becomes a source of exploitation of others.

In order to keep the power of capital within specified limits, the Quran forbids the accumulation or concentration of wealth, prohibits the taking of interest, disallows speculation, imposes the law of inheritance and a sysetm of taxation. In addition to the above, for the protection of collective rights, there is a duty imposed on the State to continuously make efforts in providing basic necessities of life such as food, clothing, shelter, education, medical aid and employment to its citizens. Thus for the realisation of these objectives, any steps which the State may take, shall be considered in accordance with the Quran and Sunnah so long as these steps are not opposed to or in conflict with the Quranic Injunctions.

Quaid-i-Azam fully realised that there was no room for Capitalism (in its generally accepted sense) in Islamic society. Accordingly, he was opposed to the adoption of Western capitalist economic system in Pakistan. In his speech at the opening ceremony of the State Bank of Pakistan on 1st July, 1948, he proclaimed:[10]

"The economic system of the West has created almost insoluble problems for humanity and to many of us it appears that only a miracle can save it from the disaster that is now facing the world. It has failed to do justice between man and man, and to eradicate friction from the international field. On the contrary, it was largely responsible for the two world wars in the last half century. The Western world, in spite of its advantages of mechanisation and industrial efficiency, is today in a worse mess than ever before in history. The adoption of Western economic theory and practice will not help us in achieving our goal of creating a happy and contented people."

Similarly, Quaid-i-Azam could not accept the Communist Ideology, economic theory and practice. While addressing the Punjab Muslim Students Federation at Lahore on 19th March, 1944, he proclaimed:[11]

"I warn the communists to keep their hands off Muslims.... Islam is their guide and complete code for their life. They do not want any isms."

Quaid-i-Azam wanted to base the economy of Pakistan on *Iqtisad*, the Islamic economic system, when on the occasion of the opening ceremony of the State Bank of Pakistan on 1st July, 1948, he proclaimed:[12]

"We must work our destiny in our own way and present to the world an economic system based on true Islamic concepts of equality of man and social justice. We will thereby be fulfilling our mission as Muslims and giving the humanity the message of peace which alone can save it and would secure the welfare, happiness and prosperity of mankind."

In reply to a question as to what would be the economic policy of Pakistan in an interview to a representative of the foreign Press, on 8th November, 1945, he said:[13]

> "You are asking me to interpret what the Government will do. But personally I believe that in these modern days essential key industries ought to be controlled and managed by the State. That applies also to certain public utilities. But what is a key industry and what is a utility service are matters for the lawmakers to say, not for me."

If the views of Quaid-i-Azam are explained in the light of modern terminology of economics, he contemplated an order for Pakistan based on 'mixed economy', i.e. an economy which permits individual enterprise within specified limits and side by side implements the principle of State control.

There are statements of Quaid-i-Azam, for instance, his address to the Karachi Chamber of Commerce on 27th April, 1948[14] in which he enumerated the industries then reserved for management by the State as consisting of Arms and Munitions of War, generation of Hydel Power, and manufacture of Railway wagons, Telephone, Telegraph and Wireless Apparatus, whereas all other industrial activity was left open to private enterprise which, according to him, would be given every facility a Government could give for the establishment and development of industry. Similarly, there are his statements, for instance, his speech on the occasion of laying the foundation stone of the building of a textile mill on 26th September, 1947[15] in which he insisted on private sector to provide for proper residential accommodation and other amenities for workers and labourers, because, according to him, no industry could thrive without contented labour. But it is obvious that Quaid-i-Azam desired to give the power to the National and Provincial Assemblies to determine as to which more basic or key industries or public utilities should be brought under State control and which should be left open to private enterprise. Therefore, according to him, it were only the representatives of the people who could make laws concerning the extent of landholdings and nationalisation or denationalisation of a particular basic or key industry or a public utility in accordance with the collective needs and requirements of the community. According to Quaid-i-Azam

the establishment of such an economic order would facilitate the realisation of the ideals of Islamic social justice, equality and brotherhood of man. In order to distinguish Islam from the atheistic Socialism of Pandit Nehru, he once termed Islamic economic system as 'Islamic Socialism' (Speech. Chittagong 26th March, 1948).[16] But by the use of this expression he meant nothing more than what he intended to mean.

Quaid-i-Azam was aware that the object of the economic teachings of Islam is to realise the ideals of equal distribution of wealth and a classless society through the politico-moral principles of equality, brotherhood, justice and evolution (i.e. with the consent of the people secured through democratic means) and not through class hatred, violence, destruction and revolution.

The ultimate aim of *Iqtisad* is to bring into being a welfare State of the Middle Class, because according to the Islamic moral code, the respectability of a person depends on the nobility of his character, and not on his wealth or poverty. Hence the object of the economic teachings of the Quran is to provide facilities for the have-nots so that they could achieve the living standard of the middle class, and to impose restrictions on sources of income of the haves so that they could not step beyond middle class. This is precisely what is meant by *Iqtisad*, the only method which, according to Islam, is easy and practicable.

A community which believes in *Iqtisad* (i.e. moderation) in the sphere of economics must naturally pursue a bilateral foreign policy and foreign trade. The principles of Pakistan's foreign policy were laid down by Quaid-i-Azam in February, 1948 when he proclaimed:[17]

> "Our foreign policy is one of friendliness and goodwill towards all the nations of the world. We do not cherish aggressive designs against any country or nation. We believe in the principles of honesty and fair-play in national and international dealings and are prepared to make our utmost contribution to the promotion of peace and prosperity among all the nations of the world."

The Ideology of Pakistan when approached in the light of Quaid-i-Azam's statements is simply this that Islam is a complete code of life for Muslims. It is the source of their spiritual, moral as well as temporal values and so long as Islam is the basis of Pakistani Nationalism, Patriotism, Secularism, Constitutionalism, as well as Socialism, there is a chance of our survival as a people. If this basis ceases to exist, Pakistan shall be no more what it is. All these 'isms' are creation of human mind. They are trends of human thought moving in different directions, opposing one another and in constant conflict with each other. Islam has the capability of assimilating, absorbing, embracing and dominating all these 'isms.' Islam does not restrict the movement of Pakistanis in any of these directions; it only controls and guides them and so long as Islam is there to provide the guidance, there will be coherence and consistency in our movement irrespective of the direction we may take. This is precisely the reason why Quaid-i-Azam had declared that Muslims did not need any 'isms' and that Islam was their guide and complete code for their life.

CHAPTER 2

SOCIAL IDEAS OF IQBAL

Before considering the sociology of Iqbal, it is necessary to trace from his writings the answer to such questions as: What was the basis of his thought? To whom did he address? And, what were his own views regarding the implementation of his ideas?

While presenting his Memorial to the Holy Prophet in the last poem of *Rumuz-i-Bekhudi*,[1] Iqbal writes:

"O Prophet of God! If the mirror of my heart is devoid of lustre and if my thought conceals anything other than the Quran, then rent the veil of its honour, disgrace me on the Day of Reckoning, sweep clean the garden of your Community of my offending thorn, and deprive me of the pleasure of kissing your holy foot. But if I have threaded on the chain of my works, the pearls of the mysteries of the Quran, and if I have spoken truth to the Muslims, then plead to Almighty God my cause that my love be locked in the embrace of action."

In the opening poem of *Javid-nama*,[2] Iqbal prays to God:

"I have lost hope in the older men, and I have a message for tomorrow. Therefore, help the youth to comprehend my works and fathom the depths of my thought with ease".

In *Asrar-i-Khudi*[3] he proclaims:

"My song is unconcerned with the accompanying instrument, because I am the voice of the poet of tomorrow".

These writings indicate that the Quran was the basis of Iqbal's thought, that his message was directed to the younger generation of Muslims, and that his ideas are still to be implemented.

Iqbal was born in that period of Islamic history when Muslims had been politically subjugated by the Western colonial powers. They had lost their sense of unity owing to racial, linguistic or territorial differences, and were consequently victims of the economic exploitation of the West. Islamic thought had become static, and due to the ruler-ruled relationship, such new ideas as Nationalism, Patriotism, Secularism, Constitutionalism and Socialism, were being imported from the West into the world of Islam. Iqbal's primary interest was the realisation of Muslim unity. He examined these new ideas from this stand point and was eventually led to the conclusion that whatever be their positive or practical value, they were incapable of bringing about this unity.

He was opposed to the capitalist, national and secular concept of democracy, mainly because it had given birth to Imperialism which was the root-cause of political, economic, and cultural exploitation of the Muslims. Therefore, he concerned himself first, to portray in his works the motivating principles behind such European movements as Communism and Fascism which had emerged as protests or reaction against Imperialism, in order to inform the Muslims as to what was happening in the West; and second, to bring home to the Muslims that the only way by which they could emancipate themselves from the exploitation of Imperialism was to recreate a sense of unity through the teachings of Islam.

Iqbal had selected Islam as a weapon, in preference to the contemporaneous creeds of Communism and Fascism, to combat Imperialism. Consequently, totally ignoring the First World War he devoted himself to the writing of *Asrar-i-Khudi* (1915) and *Rumuz-i- Bekhudi* (1918). This was the period when Iqbal laid the foundations of his philosophy and made the Muslims realise that through the reconstruction of their individual and collective ego, they could rediscover their lost sense of unity and regain their lost freedom, power and glory. The Muslim Community, according to him, was a unique community because it was founded on brotherhood among unique individuals. By opposing the un-Islamic ideas of the West, Iqbal led to the revival of Islamic teachings in the twentieth century in a somewhat similar manner as Ghazali had accomplished the revival of Islamic sciences in the twelfth century by rejecting the un-Islamic concepts derived from Greece.

Iqbal's first publication (1900) was a book in Urdu prose entitled *Ilmul Iqtisad* (The Science of Economics). It was probably written with a view to persuade the Urdu speaking Muslims to study Political Economy, but it also discloses Iqbal's deep interest in this subject. Although it does not contain his own social ideas as they had not been formulated at that stage, Iqbal writes in the Foreword that nations which are indifferent to the improvement of their economy shall undoubtedly fail to survive in modern times.

With the First World War came the Russian Revolution and Communism was established in Russia. Since it was a reaction against Tzarist Imperialism, the basic principles of the Communist movement were portrayed by Iqbal in his *Payam-i-Mashriq* (1922). Under the chapter *Naqsh-i-Farang* of this work were included poems entitled: *Payam*, *Suhbat-i-Raftgaan der Alam-i-Bala*, *Mohawara mabain Hakim Fransawi Augustus Comte-o-Mard-i-Mazdoor*, *M. Lenin-o-Qaiser William*, *Qismatnama Sarmayadar-o-Mazdoor*, and *Nawa-i-Mazdoor*. In the same year was published his famous Urdu poem entitled *Khizer-i-Rah*. It is necessary to study these poems for a proper understanding of the evolution of the sociology of Iqbal.

Payam is in fact a message to the European colonial powers. In the seventh and eighth stanzas of this poem Iqbal addresses these nations thus:[4]

> "The era of Imperialism has ended. The labourer is aspiring to snatch power from your hands. Therefore, if you are farsighted, then learn this lesson from your present experience that human life is determined to construct a new world for itself".

He continues prophetically:

> "I see signs of rejuvenation in the old (subjugated) world. The time is fast approaching when Imperialism shall be wound up and slaves will be free. I can feel this revolution coming in all haste but I cannot explain how or why do I feel that way. Fortunate is the person who has an eye on the present events and is preparing himself to live in the future".

Suhbat-i-Raftgaan der Alam-i-Bala is a discussion among Tolstoy, Karl Marx, Hegel, Mazdek and Kohkan (Ferhad, the Mountain-Cutter) which proceeds as follows:[5]

Tolstoy: "The strength of Imperialism depends entirely on military power. Each and every soldier of the army of the Kings is a mercenary and an instrument of the devil because for his personal survival he reddens his hands with the blood of innocent people. Imperialism, Church and Nationalism are an intoxicating potion by administering which the ruler secures the souls of the ruled."

Marx: "Under the Capitalist order Man slits the throats of his brethren."

Hegel: "The apparent differences in the universe are actually the facets of one and the same reality. The existence of perpetual conflict in contradictory aspects of life is deliberately created in order to keep the universe going. Hence the confrontation of capital and labour or ruler and ruled is essentially a natural phenomenon."

Tolstoy: "You keep your individualistic philosophy to yourself, because it preaches to the labourer to remain content with his abject condition."

Mazdek: "I am happy to see that the seed I sowed in the soil of Iran is bearing fruit in Russia and Germany. The palaces of Kings and nobles are heavy with an air of mourning. Arise, O labourer! The days of Imperialism are over. Therefore, snatch the power from the hands of the master."

Kohkan: "Although the capitalist talks of peace, his heart is as blood-thirsty as that of Chengiz. His treachery has made me so desperate that reason has given way to madness and I am compelled to tell my comrades. It is my axe which cuts the mountain but the Imperialism of Parvez continues to flourish in the world. O labourers! Know this that whatever exists between the earth and heaven is in perpetual motion. Hence unite, and march together so that the speed of the caravan is increased".

Mohawara mabain Hakim Fransawi Augustus Comte-o-Mard-i-Mazdoor is a dialogue between Augustus Comte and the Labourer:[6]

Comte: "All human beings are connected with one another like the organs of a body. Under the law of nature just as human organs have pre-ordained functions to perform, the mind to think and the feet to walk, in the same way different classes in human society are created in order to perform their respective fixed functions. There are capitalists, labourers, rulers, ruled etc. because they are made to perform different functions. It is essentially this division of functions which gives order and security to life".

Labourer: "O Philosopher! You think you can deceive me by your philosophy and persuade me to accept the state of perpetual bondage. It is my axe which makes the streams of bliss flow from mountains, but you want to hand over the right of Kohkan (labourer) to Parvez (capitalist). The being of a capitalist is a load upon the shoulders of the earth. He does no work besides eating and sleeping. Hence all leisure, happiness and joy in the world result from the efforts of the labourer"

M. Lenin-o-Qaiser William is also a dialogue between the Communist Revolutionary and the German Emperor:[7]

Lenin: "In this world for centuries Man has been ground like a piece of grain between two grind-stones. On the one hand, he was the slave of the Tzar or the Emperor, and on the other, he was caught in the grip of the Church. Eventually, tired of his wretched life, he has torn his master's shirt which was smeared with his blood. The flames of the masses' fire have burnt to ashes the cloaks of the Pope as well as the Emperor."

William: "You must not blame Imperialism because slavery is ingrained in Man. When he gets sick of old gods, he himself carves out new ones. There is no reason for complaining against the tyranny of highwaymen, because the travellers are robbing themselves. If the masses were to wear the emperor's crown, their assembly would not remain without tumult or commo-

tion. Lust for power cannot be erased from the heart of Man. A fire-place can only hold fire. Therefore, the bride of power shall continue to enslave the masses. The suitors of Sherin (the beloved of Parvez as well as Ferhad) shall always be available. Whether it is Khusro (Emperor) or it is Kohkan (Mountain-Cutter). (The same thought is expressed in an Urdu verse of Iqbal:[8] "If the reins of government are in the hands of the labourer, so what? In the methods of Kohkan, the Mountain-Cutter, are also concealed the strategies of Parvez, the Emperor).

Qismatnama Sarmayadar-o-Mazdoor is a satirical poem in the form of a monologue in which the capitalist suggests to the labourer a 'just division' of economic means so that both the parties are satisfied. The capitalist says:[9]

"The noise and din of steel mills is mine but the sweet hymns and songs of the Church are all yours. The fields, orchasds and trees of the world are mine, but the gardens of paradise, its streams and beauties are all yours. Wine, which causes headache, is mine, but pure and clear water, the favourite drink of Adam and Eve, is yours. Ducks, partridges and pigeons are mine, but the shadow of Huma and the wings of Anqa are yours. In short, the earth and whatever is contained in its stomach is my share, but from the earth upto high heavens everything that exists is all yours".

Nawa-i-Mazdoor is a monologue of a labourer crying:[10]

"I cover myself with rags whereas, as a result of my hardwork, the master, who does not move his hands and feet at all, wears silk and brocade. With the strength of my arm, I dig the mine, but the diamonds it yields decorate the fingers of the *Wali*. The pearls studded in the saddle of the horse of the *Amir* are actually the tears of my children, and the leeches of the Church have fattened by sucking my blood. It is the sweat of my labour which strengthens Imperialism. My sighs turn barren and sterile land into gardens and orchards. It is due to my labour and suffering that the faces of the rich are fresh and colourful. But listen, O Labourers! A new song is rising from the nature's

harp. Imperialism is in a state of life and death. Let us pour that sharp wine in the glass which melts it like wax. Come, let us take our revenge from the looters of the garden and on their dead bodies lay the foundations of a new society of buds and flowers. For how long are you going to circle around the flame like moths and remain strangers to yourselves?"

Since these poems were written in 1922, the mode of expression adopted is identical. For instance, in *Khizer-i-Rah* under the title *Sarmaya-o-Mehnat* (Capital and Labour), Khizer, the guide, declares:[11]

"Go to the workman, the toiler, and deliver my message to him! These words are not mine alone, but it is a voice that is swelling the four corners of the world. Oh, the crafty capitalist has devoured your flesh and for ages your reward has been running astray on the horns of the wild deer. The capitalist drops grudging wages in the hand that forges all wealth, just as the poor receive in charity what their betters throw away. He has fed you with *hashish* like the old Man of the Mountain; and you, poor innocent, took it for a sweet flavoured dish. The rich are cunning and from race, nationalism, church, empire, culture and colour, have brewed drugs to serve their needs. But you have rushed upon your doom for the sake of these false gods and in a state of intoxication have been robbed of life's treasure. The capitalist has won through his clever moves, and you, forever unsuspecting, have lost the game. But now come! The assembly of the earth has changed its ways and in the Orient as well as the Occident, your own age is about to commence.'

From these poems of Iqbal, the supporters of Communism got the impression that Iqbal was Communist. In those days at Lahore a newspaper called *Inqilab* used to appear for the propagation of Communist ideas. In its issue dated 23rd June, 1923 an article was published to the effect that if it was a crime to hold Bolshevik views, then how could Iqbal escape from the clutches of law. The Bolshevik system of government was based on the politico-economic creed of Karl Marx and this creed was commonly known as Socialism or Communism. In these circumstances, if any person

endowed with little intelligence, were to glance through Iqbal's *Payam-i-Mashriq* and *Khizer-i-Rah*, he would undoubtedly arrive at the conclusion that Iqbal was not only a Communist, but an arch-preacher of Communism.

In refutation of this article, Iqbal wrote a letter which was published in the daily *Zamindar* dated 24th June, 1923. Since this letter is a key for understanding Iqbal's social ideas, its contents require careful study. He wrote:[12]

> "Some one....in some newspaper....has attributed Bolshevik ideas to me. Since in my opinion holding of Bolshevik views amounts to the renunciation of Islam, it is my duty to refute this charge. I am a Muslim. It is my affirmed conviction, and this conviction is founded on sound and demonstrable reasoning, that the Quran has suggested the best cure for economic ailments of different classes of human society. Undoubtedly when the power of capital transgresses the limits of moderation, it becomes a kind of curse for the world. But in order to release the world from its pernicious effects, the method of totally eliminating this element from the economic structure, as advocated by the Bolsheviks, is not correct. The Quran has recommended the enforcement of the law of Inheritance, organisation of *Zakat* etc. for confining this power within proper limits, and if human nature is kept in view, it is possible for one to realise that this is the only method which is practicable. Russian Bolshevism emerged as an extreme reaction against the shortsighted and selfish Capitalism of Europe. But the fact remains that Western Capitalism and Russian Bolshevism result from a bitter struggle being waged between the haves and have-nots. However, as I have mentioned above, the way of moderation is the only correct and appropriate way which the Quran has recommended to us. The object of Islamic *Shariat* is to stop one group from exploiting the other through the power of capital, and I believe that for the realisation of this object, the proper method is the one which has been revealed to us by our Holy Prophet. Islam does not completely eliminate the power of capital from its economic structure, but after a careful study of human nature, retains it and recommends an economic system through the implementation of which this

power could never transgress its proper limits. It is unfortunate that Muslims have not yet cared to study the economic aspect of Islam, otherwise they would have certainly realised what a blessing Islam is in this respect. It is my conviction that in: 'You have been bestowed with the Blessing of Brotherhood'—the reference is to this very blessing, because individuals constituting a nation cannot establish Brotherhood in the real sense unless and until they maintain equality with one another in all respects, and the realisation of this principle of equality is not possible without the enforcement of a social system which confines the power of capital within proper limits. I am certain that the Russians themselves, after discovering the faults of their present system through experience, shall be compelled to turn to some other type of economic structure the foundational principles of which are either purely Islamic or identical to them. At present, the social ideal or the course of action adopted by the Russians, howsoever praiseworthy it may be, can possibly have no attraction for the Muslims. Muslims of India and other parts of the world, who read European literature on Political Economy, get very easily carried away by Western ideas. It is essential that in these times they should profoundly study the economic teachings of the Quran. I genuinely believe that they will find the solution of all their problems in this Book. The Muslim members of the Labour Union of Lahore in particular, must direct their attention to these teachings. I wholeheartedly support and sympathise with their aims and objects, but I trust that they will not adopt any such course of action or social ideal which is opposed to the teachings of the Quran".

This letter makes it abundantly clear that the real object of Iqbal in portraying Communist ideas in *Payam-i-Mashriq* or *Khizer-i-Rah* was to explain that the Communist movement was an extreme reaction against Imperialism and selfish Capitalism of Europe. He was obviously not recommending the subjugated Muslims to accept the Communist creed, but through these poems he was attempting to reveal before the Muslim eye the spectacle of conflict between Communism and Imperialism in the West. He points out in *Bang-i-Dara*[13] (1924):

"The labour and capital are pitched against each other in the world. Let us watch who ultimately wins or loses in this con-

flict. The terrible calamity which has been hastened by their own misdeeds, cannot be averted through crafty reasoning or hypocritical diplomacy. All the armies of Gog and Magog (the illusion probably is to Red Chinese) have been released, and now the Muslim eye can actually see (instead of visualising) the interpretation of the Quranic word *Yansaloon* (swarming from every hill)."

It has already been explained that Iqbal was opposed to Western capitalist, nationalist and secular democratic order, Imperialism as well as Colonialism. Therefore, he deliberately projected in his works the standpoints of such movements as Communism and Fascism which had emerged as a reaction against them. He may have sympathetically watched the Russian experiment with Communism, because, in his view, at least in appearance, the aim of Communism, like Islam, was to destroy Monarchy, to end Ecclesiastic hierarchy, and to realise the ideal of Equality. But since this ideal was exclusively founded on Materialism instead of having been controlled and guided by the Commands of God, it was abominable to Iqbal and unacceptable. Hence, whenever he addressed the Muslims on this subject, he always tried to turn their attention to the Quranic teachings. For instance, in the poem *Ishtrakiat* he wrote:[14]

"The policies of certain nations make me feel that the feverish activity of Russians is not fruitless. Apprehension has resulted in the belligerency of their thoughts. This age is weary of antiquated methods. Immerse yourself in the Quran, O Muslim! May God grant you the capacity of novelty in thought and action. The truth which is so far concealed in the Quranic verse 'Say—the surplus' (2; verse 219) may be revealed in this era."

Iqbal advanced the same viewpoint in a different way in his presidential address to the All-India Muslim Conference Session held at Lahore on 21st March, 1932. He said:[15]

"The people of Asia are bound to rise against the acquisitive economy which the West has developed and imposed on the nations of the East. Asia cannot comprehend modern Western

capitalism with its undisciplined individualism. The Faith which you represent recognises the worth of the individual and disciplines him to give away his all to the service of God and Man. Its possibilities are not yet exhausted. It can still create a new world where the social rank of Man is not determined by his caste or colour or the amount of dividend he earns, but by the kind of life he lives; where the poor tax the rich, where human society is founded not on the equality of stomachs, but on the equality of spirits, where an untouchable can marry the daughter of a king, where private ownership is a trust, and where capital cannot be allowed to accumulate so as to dominate the real producers of wealth".

As for land, Iqbal had always been of the view that it was the property of God. He wrote in *Bang-i-Dara*[16] (1924):

"One day a tenant and a landlord were involved in an argument. Each of them claimed that land was his property. The tenant asserted that land belonged to him who tilled it, but the landlord maintained that this was sheer madness. I asked land, 'Whose property are you?' It replied that whatever the upright landlord or downtrodden tenant might claim, it was certain that all that existed under the sky belonged to God".

Iqbal was elected member of the Punjab Legislative Council in 1926. A perusal of his speeches[17] in the Council reveals that in his opinion the *Crown* or *State* could not claim the ownership of land. He was opposed to *Mukhabara* (the collection of *batai* or rent from land), and the recommendations he made in regard to Land Reforms during this period were: Half of the land which was owned by the *Crown* should be reserved for sale in instalments to the landless tenants; Agricultural Tax should be imposed at the same ratio as Income Tax is assessed; and just as low income bracket groups (whose yearly income was upto Rs. 2,000/- in those days) were exempt from the payment of Income Tax, in the same way land revenue should be remitted in the case of petty landowners (who held land to the extent of five bighas, according to Iqbal). However, the proposals of Iqbal were not accepted.

Javid-nama was published in 1932. It is necessary to study this work also for a proper understanding of the sociology of Iqbal. In

this work, Iqbal advances his views regarding the ownership of land in the light of Quranic teachings and at the same time presents a critical analysis of Communism and Imperialism.

Under the chapter *Falak-i-Atarad* (Firmament of Mercury), Iqbal states the condition of Muslims to Jamaluddin Afghani:[18]

"The Muslims have fallen under the spell of Nationalism and have lost faith in the truth of Islam. With Europe's noose around their necks, the Turks, Iranians and Arabs lie benumbed. On the one hand, they are victims of exploitation of capitalist Imperialism, and on the other, Communism threatens to bedim the flame of their Faith and destroy their communal unity."

Then follows, through the words of Jamaluddin Afghani, a critical analysis of Communism and Imperialism:

"The author of *Das Kapital* (Karl Marx), who belonged to the Jewish race, was a Gabriel-less prophet. The falsehood of his writings is mixed with an element of truth. He possessed the heart of a believer and the head of an infidel. (Iqbal uses the same expression for the German thinker Nietzsche, whom the Fascists claimed as their prophet). Since the Western nations are devoid of spiritualism, they are searching for their souls in their stomachs. But the soul cannot borrow its tint, hue and colour from the stomach. Communism is concerned with nothing except the body because the false prophet of this creed has founded it on the equality of stomachs. Equality can only be founded on fraternity and fraternity lies in the heart, not in the stomach. Similarly, Imperialism devotes itself exclusively to fattening the flesh. Its dark breast, too, is devoid of heart. Like a bee it sucks the juice of flowers, leaving all its petals apparently gay. Although the scent and play of colour continues to evoke the bird's plaintive song, it is merely in appearance; the essence is taken away and only the shell is left behind. Hence both these organisations of human life are incomplete and insufficient. Both are inimical to the soul, both deny God and deceive Man. Communism thrives on class hatred and destruction whereas the aim of Imperialism is to extort money from the oppressed. Both these systems are two slabs of stone

between which Man is ground like a piece of glass. Communism destroys knowledge, religion and art; and Imperialism deprives the body of its soul and snatches bread from the hand. Both these orders take their roots from Materialism. They strive to brighten the body and darken the soul. But the aim of human life is not only to eat, drink and die like animals; it is to 'burn and build' i.e. to love God and to construct the world in accordance with His Injunctions."

Afterwards, through the voice of Syed Halim Pasha, Iqbal teaches:

"O Muslim! Remember, you cannot construct your life by imitating others. Under the law of nature Man can really progress only through his own research and ideas. (What Iqbal means is that when a nation imitates another nation, it is bound to be subjugated by the other). A living nation is capable of creating new worlds through its own thought and deeds. Therefore, if you have the determination of *real* Muslims, then look into your self and delve deep in the Quran. You will discover that its verses hide hundreds of new worlds and its moments conceal thousands of new eras. In order to solve the present problems only the application of a single point of the Quran is sufficient. But you can comprehend this point only if your breast contains an understanding heart. A Muslim is one of the signs of God and hence has the vitality to survive and progress in every age. When one world becomes outworn, he can construct another through the teachings of the Quran".

Then in the poem *Arz Milk-i-Khuda'st*[19] (Land is the Property of God) Iqbal explains his views regarding the ownership of land. There is a repetition of these views in the poems *Al-arzo Lillah* (*Bal-i-Jibril*) and *Iblis ki Majlis-i-Shura* (*Armughan-i-Hijaz*). Iqbal maintains that the real owner of land is *Allah*. Land is His wealth and this precious bounty has been bestowed freely on Man for his benefit (like light, air, water or fire). Man may use land but he cannot claim property in it. In other words, the status of the land-owner is merely that of a 'trustee' or a 'lessee' and he can hold land in that capacity only to the extent which he can self-cultivate.

Thereafter, again through the words of Jamaluddin Afghani, Iqbal points out:[20]

"Every ardent seeker of truth finds Islam as unusual essentially because the verses of the Quran reveal new interpretations with changing times. If Man acquires a genuine understanding of the manifest symbols of the Quran, he can revolutionise and establish a new order.... The Russians have drawn a new pattern of life which claims to provide daily bread but disrupts Faith. Since the creed of a Muslim is to accept truth and to offer truth to others, convey my message to the Russians."

In *Payam-i-Afghani ba Millat-i-Roosia* (Afghani's Message to the Russians), Iqbal maintains:[21]

"Since Mustafa (the Holy Prophet) ceased to dwell in the hearts of Muslims, they are unable to pluck the fruit which the Quran yields and have fallen prostrate before Imperialism. But you Russians, like our ancestors, after destroying Imperialism and Ecclesiastic hierarchy, have laid the foundations of a new order. Learn an object lesson from us because your destiny is linked with what befalls the nations of the East. As you have done away with the false gods of old, you completed the requirements of *la'ila*. Now therefrom proceed further to *il'lallah*. Human nature needs 'affirmation' and cannot survive in the static state of 'negation'. Therefore, if you want to establish a new world order, then find a firm basis on which it could be constructed. Illumine your thought with the light of the Quran. You will realise that all the modes of Government are crooked and deceptive except the Quranic mode. The Quranic *faqr* (supreme indifference to material comforts) is the very quintessence of sovereignty. The Quran is a message of death for the capitalist and is succour for the destitute. It forbids accumulation of capital, usury and speculation. It abolishes Feudalism in all its forms because according to its principles land is God's estate and Man's status is merely that of a trustee or a lessee; he can only seek livelihood from land. Furthermore, the Quran is anti-monarchical, anti-ecclesiastic as well as anti-monopolist. It aims at establishing equality and brotherhood among human beings on the foundation of unity of the entire

human race. Therefore, the Quran is not only a book, it is a message of revolution. When it soaks one's soul, it transforms the soul and as a result the world is shaped anew. The Quran, like God, has two aspects. One is manifest and the other concealed. The manifest aspect relates to the enforcement of the Laws of God in changing times, and the concealed is to love Him permanently. The Quran is a living miracle because its teachings provide guidance to Man in every age in accordance with his needs, requirements and altered conditions of life. Thus through the Quran you could know, not only the ups and downs of human life but also its ultimate destiny."

On the publication of *Javid-nama*, the supporters of Communism lost interest in the social ideas of Iqbal, obviously because they were based on the Quran rather than Karl Marx's *Das Kapital.* But after the death of Iqbal and during the course of opposition to the Pakistan movement, particularly in its early stages, they categorised Iqbal as 'abstract visionary', 'confused and contradictory thinker', 'supporter of Fascism', 'reactionary' etc. However, recently the interest in Iqbal's sociology has been revived and a few intellectuals who claim themselves to be progressive, are once again endeavouring to demonstrate that Iqbal was profoundly influenced by Karl Marx and, therefore, was a supporter of Socialism.

Their first argument is the same old argument that in *Payam-i-Mashriq* and *Khizer-i-Rah* Iqbal supported Socialism. But since Iqbal had himself refuted this charge through his letter dated 24th June, 1923, there is no need of going into the details of this argument here.

Their second argument is that in *Javid-nama*, Iqbal described Socialism in the Soviet Union as founded on *la'ila* (Negation of God), but if *il'lallah* (Affirmation of God) could be added to it, then he had no objection in accepting the creed of Socialism.

It is clear from the writings of Iqbal that through offering *il'lallah* (or Islam) to the Russians, he intended to persuade them to comprehend and follow the social teachings of the Quran which, according to him, were far superior to Socialism. Iqbal has not laid emphasis on the vital significance of *il'lallah* in human societies

only in *Javid-nama*. He returns to this theme again and again in *Pas che bayad Kard* as well as *Zarb-i-Kalim*. In *Pas che bayad Kard* he writes:[22]

> "When Russia was thoroughly and completely oppressed by the tyranny and exploitation of Imperialism, she uttered the word *la* (No). I have looked into the modes of her thought which is based on the principles: No Monarchy, no Church and no God. Her thought is bedimmed by the strong wind of *la* and so long as she is governed by negation, she cannot move in the direction of *illa* (Except). Life must fail to find security in the static condition of *la*, because the entire universe moves in the direction of *illa*."

In *Zarb-i-Kalim* he points out:[23]

> "In order to understand the nature of life the beginning is with *la* and the object is *illa*. But it is a message of death if *la* is separated from *illa*. That nation whose soul cannot proceed beyond *la*, be sure, its days are numbered."

Their third argument is that Iqbal in his letter dated 30th June, 1931 addressed to Sir Francis Younghusband wrote: "Since Bolshevism plus God is almost identical with Islam, I shall not be surprised if, in the course of time, either Islam devours Russia or Russia Islam."

Since this sentence is usually quoted out of its context, it would be useful to quote the relevant contents of the letter. Iqbal writes:[24]

> "Any attempt on the part of Great Britain at the next Round Table Conference to take an undue advantage of communal split (in India) will ultimately prove disastrous to both countries. If you transfer political authority to the Hindu and keep him in power for any material benefit to Great Britain, you will drive the Indian Muslims to use the same weapons against the Swaraj or Anglo-Swaraj Government as Gandhi did against the British Government. Moreover, it may result in the whole of Muslim Asia being driven into the lap of Russian Communism

which would serve as a *coup de grace* to British supremacy in the East. I do not myself believe that the Russians are by nature an irreligious people. On the contrary, I think that they are men and women of strong religious tendencies and the present negative state of Russian mind will not last indefinitely, for no system of society can rest on an atheistic basis. As soon as things settle down in that country and its people have time to think calmly, they will be forced to find a positive foundation for their system. Since Bolshevism plus God is almost identical with Islam, I should not be surprised if, in the course of time, either Islam devours Russia or Russia Islam. The result will depend, I think, to a considerable extent, on the position which is given to the Indian Muslims under the new constitution."

The contents of this letter reveal that Iqbal is warning the British—if they transfer political authority exclusively to the Hindu majority and do not accept the separate national status of the Muslims under the new constitution (which followed as the Government of India Act, 1935), the whole of Muslim Asia may be driven into the lap of Russian Communism. Iqbal knows that the British are mortally afraid of Russian expansionism. Therefore, he threatens them that Russians are religious-minded like Muslims, that their atheism is only a passing phase, and that there exist possibilities of a Russo-Muslim alliance in case the British refuse to accept the Muslim demands in the forthcoming constitution.

This letter of Iqbal is merely topical, or if it has any permanent value, it is only in the context of the development of constitutional history of Muslim India. But even if the expression of Iqbal, usually put forward by the progressive intellectuals as 'Bolshevism+God =Islam', is examined in the light of his own thought, it would become abundantly clear that to Iqbal this expression is not a formula of Algebra, Mathematics, Chemistry or Physics. What he means by this expression is simply 'to bring Russian atheism within the fold of Islam' or 'to bring Bolshevism under the control and guidance of the Law of God.' However, to maintain that Iqbal used this expression in support of Socialism in the sense that he would have gladly swallowed the mixture of Bolshevism as Islam only if the passive element of God was added to it, would certainly make him turn in his grave.

The fourth argument is that in the poem *Lenin* (*in the Presence of God*) included in *Bal-i-Jibril,* Iqbal advocates the ideas of Lenin. This impression is erroneous and indicates a lack of deeper knowledge of the modes of literary expression. Iqbal has likewise written a poem on *Mussolini,* the anti-West founder of Fascism. But to propose that thereby he supported Fascist ideas would be an absurd proposition. In order to provide an objective exposition as well as analysis of contemporaneous ideas and trends of thought through the lips or voices of eminent personalities of the present and past, Iqbal followed the Persian literary tradition (Jalaluddin Rumi in particular) in adopting the method of monologue or dialogue. This technique of poetic expression is not novel and has been adopted by numerous poets with different cultural backgrounds (for instance Robert Browning in English literature). It gave Iqbal's poems a dramatic movement. Abstract metaphysical or theological concepts could be expressed lucidly and with greater power of communication as on the vast canvas of his thought, modern or old, real or imaginary, vivid or shadowy, simple or complex figures appeared and expressed their viewpoints in the forms of monologue or dialogue. A critical analysis of the ideas or trends of thought depicted by Iqbal and an exposition of his own viewpoint is easily discernible, provided that the entire canvas is kept before the mind's eye. But to pick up and isolate one character and to say that Iqhal is supporting his ideas, would amount to distorting the whole panorama of Iqbal's thought.

Their fifth argument is that in the poem: *God's Command to His Angels* appearing in *Bal-i-Jibril,* Iqbal instigates the peasants to burn every ripening ear of wheat in the field if it does not provide daily bread to them.

The very title of this poem indicates that it is not an instigation to the peasants to burn and destroy indiscriminately, but it is *God's Command to His Angels* to descend His wrath, i.e. if God's Law is not enforced and tyranny or oppression prevails, then it must be annihilated. The peasants were always *instigated* by Iqbal to burn 'the straws of other-than-God' (*Khashak-i-Ghair Allah*) and to constantly strive to unveil *Tauhid* (Unity of God). He addressed the peasant in *Bang-i-Dara* thus:[25]

"Know yourself, O Peasant! You are the grain, the field, the rain as well as the fruit. Therefore, be a flame and burn all the *straws of other-than-God.* Are you afraid of falsehood? Why? You are the very destroyer of falsehood."

In the poem: *To the Peasant of the Punjab*, he says:[26]

"Break the idols of race and tribe. Break the chains of old customs. The aim of True Religion (Islam) which always conquers is to constantly strive to unveil *Tauhid* (Unity of God) in the world."

Similarly, Iqbal was anxious to protect the rights of the labourer as he proclaims in *Bang-i-Dara*:[27]

"The mill-owner is a parasite. He is fond of pleasure and fun, and hates work. But the Command of God is: There is nothing for Man except that for which he strives. Why then should the capitalist devour the fruit of the labourer's toil?".

However, he advised the labourers and workers not to adopt any such course of action or social ideal which was opposed to the teachings of the Quran

Iqbal was also deeply concerned with the students. His message is particularly addressed to the younger generation of Muslims. He always taught the youth 'to make their *nest* within their own ego although they had education on Western lines.' He wanted them to cultivate the love of God and to tread steadfastly on the path which the Holy Prophet has carved out for the Muslims. The development of an atheistic trend among the Muslim youth disturbed Iqbal profoundly, for he always kept before his mind's eye, an important observation of Jamaluddin Afghani which is recorded in his work entitled *Radd-i-Naturia* (Refutation of the Naturists). Afghani observes that in the West even if one were to become an atheist, one remains at least a nationalist or a patriot, and eventually succeeds in discovering a new method for the welfare of his people through the novelty of his thought and action. But in the world of Islam, drifting towards atheism always implies renunciation of one's own cultural traditions and begging for the thoughts and ideas of others.

How ashamed Iqbal was of the development of an atheistic trend among the Muslim youth, can be judged from the poem entitled: *Hali's dialogue with Saadi of Shiraz in Paradise.* Saadi asks Hali about the condition of the Muslim youth and in reply Hali says:[28]

> "When one is equipped with Religion, one's ideas achieve loftiness. But as it is not so, the nature of the youth is earth-bound. If the foundation of the garden's wall is shaking, it is manifest that the beginning of the end of the garden has commenced. Since it did not get water from the sacred well of the Community, the younger generation of Muslims has succumbed to the atheistic trend. But do not mention this in the presence of the Holy Prophet, lest the Muslims of India consider me a tell-tale."

In the poem: *Addressed to Javid* (Addressed to the new Generation) of *Javid-nama,* Iqbal has revealed the secret and significance of the faith of Islam to the Muslim youth, and in his numerous other poems has dissuaded the youth from begging the thoughts and ideas of others. In the poem: *Novelty* of *Zarb-i-Kalim,* he pleads:[29]

> "If you were to look at the world through your own eyes, the heavens would illumine by the light of your vision. But this begging of thoughts and ideas from others—have you no access even to your own self?!"

Iqbal genuinely believed that the economic paradise of Muslims was concealed in the historical continuity of their religious and cultural tradition. If the youth were to carry out research, keeping this fundamental fact in view, they could certainly bring a new Society into being through creative thought and action. He points out:[30]

> "Your eye must not be impressed by a borrowed heaven because your paradise lies hidden in your own blood. Therefore, strive constantly O Being of Clay, and behold the reward of your endeavour!"

In the poem: *Theatre* of *Zarb-i-Kalim,* he warns:[31]

> "In your body's sanctum the soul of an alien? God forbid! Do not revive the trade of idolatry. The object of the farce

is to obliterate you. But if you are obliterated, there would neither be the flame of self nor the music of life."

In the poem: *Fountain* of *Zarb-i-Kalim*, he says:[32]

"The flow of the stream in the lap of *dust* is a sight which displeases my eye. Do not look at that, dear Youngman! But look at this—the fountain has risen by its inner force."

Hence Iqbal consistently impresses upon the peasants, workers and students that Islam carries a revolutionary message, and that if they determine to construct their nation in the light of Quranic teachings, they can realise the social ideal of Islam.

The sixth argument is that Iqbal in his letter dated 17th October, 1936 wrote to Khwaja Ghulam-us-Saiyidain: "As for Socialism, Islam itself is a kind of Socialism from which the Muslim society has so far not derived any benefit."

Since this sentence of Iqbal is also usually quoted out of its proper context, it would be useful to study the contents of this letter Iqbal writes:[32]

"The believers in Socialism are everywhere opposed to religious spirituality and consider it as opium. Karl Marx was the first to use the word opium in this context. I am a Muslim and *insha' allah* die as a Muslim. In my opinion the dialectic interpretation of human history is absolutely wrong. I am a firm believer of Spiritualism in the Quranic sense and I have endeavoured to explain it time and again in my numerous writings, particularly in my Persian *Masnawi*, which shall reach you in due course. The type of spiritualism which, in my view, is objectionable and contains opiumistic quality, I have condemned on many occasions. As for Socialism, Islam itself is a kind of Socialism from which the Muslim society has so far not derived any benefit"

This writing clearly shows that Iqbal considered Karl Marx's dialectic interpretation of history as absolutely wrong. He again asserts in this letter that he is a Muslim and shall die as a Muslim.

Thus if the last sentence is studied in its proper context, it simply means: Islam has its own concept of social quality and brotherhood from which the Muslim society has so far not derived any benefit.

It is established from Iqbal's writings that he regarded both the capitalist and socialist structures of economy as defective and unsuitable. He supported a social structure which was founded exclusively on the economic teachings of the Quran. Iqbal has visualised this with a remarkable clarity in his famous poem: *Satan's Parliament* of *Armughan-i-Hijaz.* Satan drew in Europe's mind the fantasy of Imperialism based on nationalist-secular-capitalist democratic order of the power elite and thereby divided humanity into the groups of exploiters and exploited. As a natural consequence thereof Communism was established on the basis of atheism. In order to destroy Communism, Satan revealed the dream of Fascist authoritarianism. Satan alone is capable of dragging European nations into war because he can seduce them into destroying one another. Since he is himself the creator and protector of the nationalist-secular-capitalist democratic order, he is not afraid of the threat of the Communist revolution of tomorrow. If he has any apprehension, it is only of the awakening of Muslims. Satan declares:[34]

> "How can the street-bawler socialists scare me? These ragged things, tortured brains and tormented souls! If there is any danger in my path, it lurks within that Community (Muslims) in whose ashes still glow the embers of an infinite hope. Anyone who understands the anatomy of the present age knows well that the monster of tomorrow is not Communism, but Islam."

Satan is afraid of the law of the Holy Prophet or the enforcement of Islamic social order. He warns his counsellors:[35]

> "Beware of the Prophet's Ordinance, a hundred times beware! For it protects the honour of women, shapes men and tries them; bears a death-warrant to every form of servitude, admits no thrones, knows neither emperor nor roadside beggar. It cleanses wealth from every foulness, making the capitalists no more than trustees of their capital. What mightier revolu-

tion could there be in thought or deed than its proclamation—the soil belongs to no sovereign, but to God. It is well for us that these enactments still lie buried snugly out of sight of human eye. Felicity it is that the *Momin* (Believer) himself has lost all faith".

Therefore, Satan commands his counsellors to make every effort to dissuade Muslims from rediscovering their real destiny. He orders them:[36]

"O keep the Muslim of this century a stranger to the realm of creative action, so that on the chess-board of existence all his pieces may be forfeited. It is better if the *Momin* is kept in bondage till the day of doom, relinquishing to others the affairs of this transient world. Yet with every breath I dread that Community's awakening whose religion's ultimate behest is to conquer, manage and control the entire universe. Keep its wits occupied with spiritual incantation, thought of dawn-prostration in prayer, and tighten round its soul the monkish bonds."

It is with this background that Iqbal wrote to Quaid-i-Azam, about eleven months before his death, on 28th May, 1937:[37]

"The League will have to finally decide whether it will remain a body representing the upper classes of Indian Muslims or Muslim masses who have so far, with good reason, taken no interest in it. Personally I believe that a political organisation which gives no promise of improving the lot of the average Muslim cannot attract our masses....The problem of bread is becoming more and more acute. The Muslim has begun to feel that he has been going down and down during the last two hundred years. Ordinarily he believes that his poverty is due to Hindu money-lending or capitalism....The atheistic Socialism of Jawaharlal is not likely to receive much response from the Muslims. The question, therefore, is: How is it possible to solve the problem of Muslim poverty? And the whole future of the League depends on the League's ability to solve this question....Happily, there is a solution in the enforcement of the Law of Islam and its future development in the light

of modern ideas. After a long and careful study of Islamic Law I have come to the conclusion that if this System of Law is properly understood and applied, at least the right to subsistence is secured to everybody. But the enforcement and development of the *Shariat* of Islam is impossible in this country without a free Muslim State or States. This has been my honest conviction for many years and I still believe this to be the only way to solve the problem of bread for Muslims as well as to secure a peaceful India....For Islam the acceptance of social democracy in some suitable form and consistent with the legal principles of Islam is not a revolution but a return to the original purity of Islam. But as I have said above, in order to make it possible for Muslim India to solve these problems, it is necessary to redistribute the country....Don't you think that the time of such a demand has already arrived? Perhaps this is the best reply you can give to the atheistic Socialism of Jawaharlal Nehru."

It may be of interest to note that even from this letter of Iqbal, the progressive intellectuals advance their seventh argument respecting his attachment to Socialism. The argument is that Iqbal has talked of 'social democracy' in this letter following the foot-steps of Lenin who was the founder of 'social democracy' in the Soviet Union.

Now it may be correct to say that 'social democracy' is a means for realising certain definite economic ends. However, its form will vary according to its foundational principles. Therefore, just as one structure is constructed differently from the other because its foundations are laid differently, a 'social democracy' founded on the Quran cannot possibly be the same as the one founded on *Das Kapital.*

There are Islamicists or orientalists who termed Jamaluddin Afghani's movement for Islamic solidarity as 'Pan-Islamism', or called the movements for political independence in different countries of the Middle East as 'Muslim nationalism'. They have likewise categorised Iqbal's social ideas as *theistic* or *Muslim Socialism.* But whatever name be given to the social ideas of Iqbal, there is no denying the fact that these ideas are founded on the Quran. It is due to this firm foundation that there exists a unity of thought among

religious, philosophic, moral, political, social as well as cultural ideas of Iqbal. But unfortunately the progressive intellectuals of this country lack this unity of thought. Their creed seems to have a dualistic logic. In purely religious or spiritual matters they claim to be bound by the Quran as revealed to Muhammad, the Prophet of God; but in socio-economic or temporal matters they follow Karl Marx's *Das Kapital.* In other words, to speak in terms of Iqbal, they place *il'lallah* and *la'ila* separately, or rather, in separate brackets. It is obviously impossible to find the existence of this form of duality in Iqbal's thought. Consequently, whenever they attempt to demonstrate him as a supporter of Socialism, they land in difficulties.

On the other hand, 'genuine' socialists have never accepted Iqbal as a supporter of Socialism. In order to give their assessment of Iqbal's social ideas, two examples may suffice. W.C. Smith (a socialist from the Western bloc) writes:[38] "His (Iqbal's) writings are throughout tinged socialistically.... But the basic fact is that he never knew what Socialism is.... He explicitly said: 'Socialism has to do only with the body.' Once this misapprehension of his is realised, the rest follows readily.... Towards the end of his life some of his friends were able to convince him that he really did not understand Socialism, and he was, perhaps, preparing to remedy this ignorance when he died."

Professor Jan Marek (a socialist from the Eastern bloc) writes:[39] "Iqbal never knew what Socialism was and never took any pains to study it profoundly.... He was chiefly interested in showing that principles, similar to those proclaimed in the Quran, could be practically applied."

Now the social ideas of Iqbal which are scattered in his writings can be assimilated in the form of points:

(1) Iqbal rejects Karl Marx's dialectic interpretation of history.

(2) Iqbal maintains that holding Bolshevik (this expression is used by him in its broad sense i.e., socialist or communist) views amounts to the renunciation of Islam.

(3) Iqbal is opposed to Monarchy, Ecclesiastic hierarchy, Feudalism as well as Capitalism for such monopolist institutions have no sanction under the Law of the Quran.

(4) Iqbal regards the Quran as a message of revolution. He believes that the Quran suggests the best cure for economic ailments of different classes of human society. He is of the opinion that the verses of the Quran can be interpreted according to the needs, requirements and altered conditions of life of each and every generation of Muslims.

(5) Iqbal believes in Islamic democracy the foundational principles of which are that sovereignty belongs to God alone and that the authority which He has delegated to the State through its citizens is to be exercised as a *trust* within the limits prescribed by Him. Therefore, according to Iqbal, confining power within the hands of a classified group for its exclusive benefit whether such group is constituted of landlords and capitalists or peasants and workers, is contrary to these fundamental principles.

(6) Iqbal is of the opinion that the object of the Quran is the implementation of a balanced social order based on fundamental human rights which ensures that no one can exploit another. It is precisely for this reason that he rejects both Capitalism and Communism as extremist viewpoints and endeavours to achieve the ideals of equality, brotherhood and justice, through the Quranic social order i.e. *Iqtisad* (Moderation) or the maintenance of a correct balance between labour and capital. Thus he contemplates the realisation of the Welfare State of the Middle Class.

(7) Iqbal is of the view that Islam acknowledges the fundamental human right of 'private ownership' as a *trust* but forbids the accumulation or concentration of capital in a few hands so that it becomes a source of exploitation of others. Therefore, although he is anti-capitalist, he does not approve of totally eliminating the power of capital from the social system.

(8) Iqbal recommends that in order to confine the power of capital within proper limits, legislation prohibiting accumulation or concentration of wealth, taking of interest on money loaned and speculation in every form should be

enforced. Furthermore, he believes that under the law of Islam, it is one of the duties of the State to provide basic necessities of life e.g., food, clothing, housing, education, medical relief and employment to all its citizens. Therefore, in order to realise the object of collective welfare (*Maslehat-i-Aama*), any steps which the State may take, shall be in conformity with the Quran and Sunnah provided that they do not violate the spirit of Quranic Injunctions.

(9) Iqbal wants to see the strict enforcement of Islamic law of inheritance, and the imposition of Islamic system of taxation (*Zakat*, *Sadaqa* and *Ushr*).

(10) Iqbal considers God as the real owner of land and Man holds it only as a *trustee* or a *lessee* for the purpose of deriving food therefrom. Hence, according to him, an individual should only hold land to the extent that he can cultivate himself. Iqbal is opposed to *Mukhabara* (collection of *batai* or rent from land) and recommends the imposition of prohibitory legislation in this respect. Furthermore, he is of the view that the State too cannot own land. Therefore, half of the land which comes under the possession or acquisition of the State, should be sold in instalments to the landless tenants. In addition to this, Iqbal suggests the imposition of Agricultural Tax in the same proportion as Income Tax is assessed; and just as low income bracket groups are exempt from the payment of Income Tax, in the same way, land revenue should be remitted in the case of petty landowners.

(11) Iqbal is fully conscious of the difficulties of peasants, workers and students and wholeheartedly sympathises with their aims and objects. But he advises them to approach and resolve their economic problems as Muslims, to study the social teachings of the Quran carefully, and not to adopt any such course of action or social ideal which is opposed to Quranic teachings.

Iqbal is the champion of religious, national, political, economic and cultural freedom of the Muslims. Therefore, he is

apprehensive of both capitalist as well as socialist Imperialism. This is probably the reason why he particularly warns the Muslim youth that begging or borrowing of thoughts and ideas or seeking aid in any form from others, always opens up ways and means to exploitation and eventual subjugation. Consequently he desires the youth to carry out research keeping in view Quranic teachings and the historical continuity of Islamic culture, and through the novelty of their thought and action, to create and construct new devices for the defence of the territorial integrity of their country and the welfare of their nation. Creative activity in human life is so essential to Iqbal that even a sin committed creatively is considered by him as a virtuous act.

CHAPTER 3

ISLAMIZATION OF THE STATE

The primary essentials of Islam are its structural principles of the Unity of God and the Finality of Muhammad's Prophethood, supplemented by the five well-defined *Obligations of the Faith* (Prayer, Fasting, Alms-giving, Pilgrimage—when one can afford it, and Holy War—when it is permissible). It is because of the belief of the Muslims in these essentials that there exists practically a uniform spiritual atmosphere in the entire Muslim world.

Islam seeks human unification through the minds of men rather than through tribal or racial relationships. It aspires to emancipate humanity from the earth, and since blood relationship implies earth-rootedness it rejects blood relationship as the basis of human unity. For Islam all human life is spiritual in its essence. It, therefore, regards everybody as a centre of latent power which could be developed by cultivating the type of character that Islam has defined for humanity.

In spite of the racial, linguistic and territorial distinctions among the Muslims, there are no social barriers among them because all Muslims regard themselves as equal before God. Islam accepts the existence of racial, linguistic and territorial diversity only for the sake of ease of reference and for the purpose of identification and not with the object of restricting the social horizon of the Muslim Community. God says in the Quran: "Verily we have made you into tribes and subtribes so that you may be identified, but the best among you in the eye of God is he who is the purest in life."[1] Hence the object of Islam is to assimilate this racial, linguistic and territorial diversity through the social mechanism it engenders. It teaches that the multiplicity of free and independent units in the Muslim world should adjust and harmonise their racial and other rivalries through the unifying bond of a common spiritual aspiration. Thus it is in this sense that to the Muslims Islam is their Patriotism as well as their faith.

According to Ibn Khaldun there are three important organs (*wazaif*) of the Islamic State. These are the *Imamat* (the office of the Head of State), the *Fatwa* (the office of the Jurist) and the *Qaza* (the office of the Judge).[2]

As for the *Imamat*, ever since the abolition of the Caliphate in Turkey (i.e., since 1924), the Muslim world seems to have accepted, expressly or impliedly, the Turkish legal opinion (*Ijtihad*) based on the arguments of the *Khwarji* and *Mutazilli* jurists of earlier Islam that the *Imamat* could be vested in a body of persons or an elected assembly. The growth of a republican spirit or the rapid development of legislative assemblies in Muslim countries has been regarded as a return to the original purity of Islam. Consequently the Constitution adopted by a Muslim Assembly and a President elected under that Constitution would be a legitimate substitute for the former *Imam*, *Khalifah*, *Sultan* or *Amir* as the Head of an Islamic State.

As for the *Fatwa*, the second important organ (*wazifah*) of the Islamic State, this office was meant for those judges (*Quzzat*) who had perfect knowledge of the four principal sources as well as the branches of Islamic jurisprudence (*Fiqh*) and had gained experience in the application of rules derived from those sources. Such judges were placed in the category of *Arbabul Ijtihad* (those who are capable of interpreting law) and some of them were appointed jurists (*Mufti*) by the Head of the State. The jurist was empowered to give the decision (*Fatwa*) whether a specific legislation made by the Head of the State was in conformity with or repugnant to the Injunctions of Islam. In the Ottoman and Mughal Empires this office gradually developed and was transformed into one of the numerous administrative departments of the State and the head of this department was given the designation of *Sheikhul Islam*.

In Pakistan, the Second Basic Principles Committee formed under the Objectives Resolution, 1949 made recommendations in its Report (submitted in 1952) for the appointment by the Head of the Stage of a *Board of Ulema* who should have an advisory capacity in determining whether the laws that the Assembly passed were in conformity with or repugnant to Islamic Injunctions. This recommendation, however, was severely criticised by the Press and public opinion went against it because it was believed that it implied separation of *Islam* from the *State*.

But how far was this view correct? Iqbal's observations in this connection are worth quoting. He says: "In Islam the spiritual and the temporal are not two distinct domains and the nature of an act, however secular in its import, is determined by the attitude of mind with which the agent does it. It is the invisible mental background of the act which ultimately determines its character. An act is temporal or profane if it is done in a spirit of detachment from the infinite complexity of life behind it; it is spiritual if it is inspired by that complexity. In Islam it is the same reality which appears as Church looked at from one point of view and State from another. It is not true to say that Church and State are two sides or facets of the same thing. Islam is a single unanalysable reality which is one or the other as your point of view varies."[3]

Iqbal was aware that things have changed and the world of Islam is today confronted with and affected by new forces set free by the extraordinary development of human thought in all its directions. He, therefore, approved of re-interpreting the foundational legal principles of Islam in the light of contemporary experience and altered conditions of modern life. He maintains: "The teaching of the Quran that life is a process of progressive creation necessitates that each generation, guided but unhampered by the work of its predecessors, should be permitted to solve its own problems."[4]

He, therefore, recommended the transfer of the power of *Ijtihad* from individual representatives of Schools to a Muslim legislative assembly. In this way, he believed: "We can stir into activity the dormant spirit of life in our legal system and give it an evolutionary outlook."[5]

But Iqbal was also conscious that a present day Muslim assembly would obviously consist of members who possessed little knowledge of the subtleties of Islamic law. Therefore, there is a likelihood that this assembly may make grave mistakes in their interpretation of law. "How can we", he raised the question, "exclude or at least reduce the possibilities of erroneous interpretation?" His answer was as follows: "The Persian Constitution of 1906 provided a separate ecclesiastical committee of *Ulema*—'conversant with the affairs of the world'—having power to supervise the legislative activity of the *Majlis*. This, in my opinion, dangerous

arrangement, is probably necessary in view of the Persian constitutional theory. According to that theory, I believe, the king is the mere custodian of the realm which really belongs to the Absent *Imam*. The *Ulema*, as representatives of the *Imam*, consider themselves entitled to supervise the whole life of the community; though I fail to understand how, in the absence of an apostolic succession, they establish their claim to represent the *Imam*. But whatever may be the Persian constitutional theory, the arrangement is not free from danger, and may be tried, if at all, only as a temporary measure in *Sunni* countries. The *Ulema* should form a vital part of Muslim legislative assembly helping and guiding free discussion on questions relating to law. The only effective remedy for the possibilities of erroneous interpretation is to reform the present system of legal education in Muhammadan countries, to extend its sphere, and to combine it with an intelligent study of modern jurisprudence."[6]

Anyway, since the public opinion in Pakistan went against the recommendation for the appointment of a *Board of Ulema* which should supervise the legislative activity of the National Assembly, the Constituent Assembly rejected this proposal and there were hopes that in the forthcoming Constitution of Pakistan the Supreme Court would be provided with the advisory jurisdiction regarding the issue whether the laws that the Assembly passed were in conformity with or repugnant to the Injunctions of Islam.

However, under Article 162 of the 1956 Constitution, the Supreme Court was given an advisory jurisdiction but only in secular legal matters. (Article 162 ran thus: "If at any time it appears to the President that a question of law has arisen, or is likely to arise, which is of such a nature and of such public importance that it is expedient to obtain the opinion of the Supreme Court upon it, he may refer the question to that court for consideration and the court may, after such hearing as it thinks fit, report its opinion thereon to the President.") If the Supreme Court had been provided with such advisory jurisdiction also in matters connected with the interpretation of Islamic law, then its function in its advisory capacity would have been similar to that of the *Fatwa*.

As for the *Qaza*, the third important organ (*wazifah*) of the Islamic State, although this office was confined to the administration

of Justice and Equity (the Department of Justice was a separate department from the very beginning in the Islamic State) the Judge (*Qazi*), unlike our present-day judges, was granted certain special powers in addition to the administration of criminal and civil justice. For instance, he was empowered to administer the estate of the deceased by checking or giving sanction to legal documents such as wills, by paying off debts and legacies, and by dividing the inheritance among the heirs of the deceased. He was authorised to administer religious endowments (*awqaf*). He was empowered to give sanction to the marriage tie and to perform the marriage ceremony (*nikah*), and he was authorised to lead the *Juma* and *Eidan* congregational prayers.

In the Indian sub-continent the British abolished the *Qaza* in 1864. It caused a great deal of restlessness among the Muslims, for there was an old Decision (*Fatwa*) to the effect that India would continue to remain *Darul Islam* (Country of Islam) so long as the *Qaza* was retained. India had been declared *Darul Harb* (Country of War) and the Muslims stopped attending the congregational prayers. The possibility of ensuing illegality of the Muslim marriage contracts, the unlawful administration of the estate of a deceased Muslim or the malversation of the Muslim religious endowments, aggravated their dislike for the British rule.

At any rate, the abolition of the *Qaza* came to stay and it is since 1864 that the Muslims of the Indian sub-continent have been deprived of one of the three most important organs of the Islamic State. This abolition led to a dislocation in the purely Islamic system of legal administration to which we were accustomed.

We, at the same time, sustained another big loss. The *Qazi's* connection with the Muslims was vital because by giving sanction to the marriage tie, by looking after the religious endowments, by leading the congregational prayers and by providing a source for the eventual appointment of the *Mufti*, he brought Islam closer to the Muslims. In fact, it was through the means of the *Qazi* that the Islamic State made Islam enter the everyday life of the Muslims. By the abolition of the *Qaza*, therefore, the Muslims (particularly the lower orders of Islam) lost contact with Islam proper and became an easy prey to the exploitation of the free-lance *Mullah* and his

unauthorised interpretation of Islam. Thus it is since 1864 that the *Mullah* began to interfere in our collective life and he continues to do so up to today.

While presenting his views on the Islamic State, Iqbal has not discussed in detail the significance and importance of the *Qaza* as one of the most vital organs of the Islamic State. However, he was fully aware of the problems which have arisen from the *Mullah's* interference in the collective life of the Muslim masses. Ever since the Muslim revival, reformers have fought against the forces of disintegration in the world of Islam. These forces, in Iqbal's opinion are: *Mullahism*, that resulted from the intellectual stagnation among the *Ulema* of Islam; *Sufism*, that led to the deterioration of the will to act among the Muslims; and *Sultanate*, that safeguarded its own interests at the cost of the people.[7] Although *Sultanate* is disappearing due to the gradual awakening of a republican spirit in the Muslim world, *Mullahism* and *Sufiism* continue to retain their paralysing hold over the Muslim masses.

It would not be out of place to mention here that the *Baghdad Caliphate*, even when at its lowest ebb, never let go of the exclusive privilege of appointing the *Qazis* and the *Imams of the Mosque*. The *Imams of the Mosque*, therefore, just as the *Qazis* and the *Muftis*, were appointed by the Head of the State in accordance with the *Tradition* quoted in the *Mishkat* in which the Holy Prophet is reported to have said that only the Head of the Islamic State or the person or persons appointed by him are entitled to preach to the people. On the authority of this *Tradition*, Iqbal maintains that in a modern Islamic State only state-appointed *Ulema* should be entitled to preach. When Ata-Turk promulgated a law to this effect in Modern Turkey, Iqbal welcomed this reform in the following words: "As to licentiate *Ulema* I would certainly introduce it in Muslim India if I had the power to do so. To the inventions of the myth-making *Mullah* is largely due the stupidity of the average Muslim. In excluding him from the religious life of the people the Ata-Turk has done what would have delighted the heart of an Ibn-i-Taimiya or a Shah Wali Ullah."[8]

Iqbal disapproved of adopting the Western conception of Secularism in the world of Islam. In his opinion the principle of Secula-

rism has been derived from the fundamental duality of spirit and matter in Christianity, and, therefore, this principle has resulted in the elimination of religion from the collective life of Western peoples, that is, it has led to the development of the secular State. In Europe Christianity developed as a monastic order establishing Church organisations in a profane world. Thus Christianity as a religion has nothing to do with the affairs of the world. Consequently the State had to be founded on the principle of Secularism. Islam, on the contrary, was, from the very beginning, a civil society with laws, civil in their nature (though believed to be revelational in origin). Although as a religion Islam has no country and as a society it has neither any specific language, nor any specific script nor any specific dress, it engenders a social mechanism which gives an internal unity and homogeneity to the Muslim Community as a whole. Thus the introduction of the principle of Secularism in the world of Islam is uncalled for and unthinkable.

At any rate, Iqbal sees no harm in separating the department of religion from the other departments of the Islamic State particularly for administrative convenience. In his opinion the Islamic idea of the division of the religious and the other functions of the State must not be confounded with the European idea of the separation of *Church* and *State*. The former is only a division of functions for administrative convenience whereas the latter is based on the fundamental dualism of spirit and matter in Christianity.

He maintains: "In the history of Muslim political experience the separation has meant only a separation of functions, not of ideas. It cannot be maintained that in Muslim countries the separation of Church and State means freedom of Muslim legislative activity from the conscience of the people which has for centuries been trained and developed by the spirituality of Islam."[9]

There are numerous instances of the division of functions in the Islamic State in past Islamic history. The doctrine of the *Major Occultation of the Imam* in a sense effected such a functional division long ago in *Shia* Iran. Similarly, in the Ottoman and the Mughal Empires the gradual creation of the offices of *Sheikhul Islam*, and

Ministers indicates that for administrative convenience the separation of the department of religion from the other departments of the State was not regarded as repugnant to Islamic Injunctions. Since the separation of the department of religion from the other departments of the Islamic State cannot possibly mean the exclusion of Islam from the collective life of the Muslims, then for administrative convenience, Iqbal maintains, there is no harm in carrying out such a division of functions in the modern Islamic State.

Could the development of a materialistic outlook in the Muslim countries be regarded as hostile to Islam? Iqbal's answer is worth quoting: "Islam has had too much of renunciation; it is time for the Muslims to look to realities. Materialism is a bad weapon against religion; but it is quite an effective one against *Mullah-craft* and *Sufi-craft* which deliberately mystify the people with a view to exploit their ignorance and credulity. The spirit of Islam is not afraid of its contact with matter. Indeed the Quran says: 'Forget not thy share in the world......' Considering the history of the Muslim world during the last few centuries, the progress of a materialistic outlook is only a form of self-realisation."[10]

There is no denying the fact that in 1953 Pakistan was declared an *Islamic* Republic, and the Constitution, which was promulgated in 1956, was called *the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan*. A question may be asked: To what extent was this Constitution's claim to be the Constitution of an *Islamic* Republic justified?

The 1956 Constitution was given the name of the Constitution of the *Islamic* Republic of Pakistan, and in its Part III the Directive Principles of State Policy were also enumerated. But as is apparent from the words of Article 23 (2) these provisions were not enforceable in any court. In other words, if these provisions had any significance, it was merely idealistic but not practical, since they were completely devoid of force of law.

If Islam was at all given any practical legal significance in the 1956 Constitution, it was, through two means. Firstly, through Article 32 (2) under which a person was not qualified for election as President unless he was a *Muslim*, and secondly, through Article 197 and 198 (in Part XII of the Constitution: entitled General Provisions:

Chapter I—Islamic Provisions). Under Article 197 the President was obliged to set up an organisation for Islamic research and instruction in advanced studies to assist in the reconstruction of Muslim society on a truly Islamic basis; and under Article 198 there existed a possibility that after the lapse of a period of five or six years the existing laws of Pakistan would be brought into conformity with the Injunctions of Islam.

As for the condition that no person could be eligible for election as President unless he was a *Muslim*, this condition does not in any way justify the claim of the 1956 Constitution to be *Islamic*, because in almost all the secular states the elected Head of the State professes the religion (or belongs to the sect) the adherents of which constitute the majority in the country.

Secondly, if under Article 197 the President of Pakistan was obliged to set up an organisation for Islamic research and instruction in advanced studies, nothing was done in this connection. If any organisations for Islamic research were established, our students failed to derive any benefit from them, consequently the object of reconstructing the Muslim society on a truly Islamic basis through these organisations was never achieved.

Thirdly, under Article 198 even if the existing laws of Pakistan could have been brought into conformity with the Injunctions of Islam, such a possibility was deferred and it might have taken five, six or even more years before the matter could have been considered seriously by the chosen representatives of the people of Pakistan.

Article 198 (1) ran thus: "No law shall be enacted which is repugnant to the Injunctions of Islam as laid down in the Holy Quran and Sunnah, hereinafter referred to as Injunctions of Islam, and existing law shall be brought into conformity with such Injunctions." It is submitted that the Constitution did not create any supervising authority which could determine whether the legislative activity of the Assemblies was repugnant to the Injunctions of Islam as laid down in the Holy Quran and Sunnah. Furthermore, the object of our present generation is to interpret the Injunctions of Islam in the light of *contemporary experience* and *altered conditions* of modern life, and not to endeavour fruitlessly to bring the existing laws into conformity with the *traditional interpretation* of the Injunctions of Islam.

It would be correct to assert that the 1956 Constitution was abrogated before having been actually put to the test, but the fact remains that the position which Islam occupied in this Constitution (in the shape and form it had been presented) amounted to a *legal fiction*, for neither was it given any force of law nor did it have any practical applicability.

The 1962 Constitution, enacted by Muhammad Ayub Khan, had the same shortcomings. Like the 1956 Constitution, it was given the name of the Constitution of the *Islamic* Republic of Pakistan, and in its Part II Principles of Policy were enumerated. But these Principles and their observation depended upon resources being available for the purpose. Furthermore, these provisions were not justiciable.

Again, almost identical methods were adopted to give a practical legal significance to Islam. First, through Article 10 under which only a *Muslim* was qualified for election as President; and second, through Articles 199 to 207 (in Part X of the Constitution entitled: Islamic Institutions). Article 207 was almost identical to Article 197 of the 1956 Constitution, i.e. the President was to establish the Islamic Research Institute in order to undertake Islamic research and instruction for the purpose of assisting in the reconstruction of Muslim society on a truly Islamic basis. However, Articles 199 to 206 presented a modification of the arrangement suggested in Article 198 of the 1956 Constitution. Under these Articles an Advisory Council of Islamic Ideology was to be constituted, the members and chairman of which were to be appointed by the President. The President retained the power of selecting proper persons for appointment to the Council as he was the sole judge of their qualifications and competency. The functions of the Council were enumerated in Article 204 as: to recommend ways and means by which Muslims could be encouraged to order their lives in accordance with the principles of Islam, to examine all the existing laws with a view to bringing them into conformity with the teachings of Islam, and to advise the National and Provincial Assemblies, the President and the Governors on any question referred to the Council about a proposed legislation as to whether it was or was not repugnant to the teachings of Islam.

The Islamic Research Institute as well as the Advisory Council of Islamic Ideology were accordingly established and also functioned for some time. But these measures obviously failed to achieve the desired objective. The Islamic Research Institute was a failure because it was not affiliated to any seat of learning or University. The Advisory Council of Islamic Ideology was even a greater failure because of an arbitrary choice of its members and a lack of popular sanction behind this institution.

If the Constitution of a Muslim Republic were given the name of the *Constitution of an Islamic Republic*, would such a Constitution be *really* entitled to claim itself as such? Two viewpoints could be presented in order to answer the above question. The first is the idealistic viewpoint and the second, the realistic and practical.

According to the idealistic viewpoint, since it was the religious fact to which is attributed the very existence of Pakistan, the State in this country must be considered *Islamic* from its very inception. Besides this, the Constitution of a country ought not to be judged only as a code of law based on logical principles. It contains, in addition to the above, hopes, desires, dreams and aspirations of the people who adopt, enact and give to themselves that Constitution. The object of the Muslims of Pakistan is to live and run their State as Muslims; therefore, the actual Islamic State is one that aims at becoming *Islamic* ideally. It is with this background that the Objectives Resolution was adopted on 12th March, 1949, six months after the death of Quaid-i-Azam. It was introduced by Liaquat Ali Khan, who described the occasion of introducing it as 'the most important occasion in the life of this country, next in importance only to the achievement of independence'. Subsequently this Resolution constituted the Preamble of the 1956 Constitution, and, in a distorted form, also the Preamble of the 1962 Constitution.

Thus to announce Pakistan as an *Islamic Republic* was to proclaim an aspiration; it was the beginning of an experiment in which the object or the end was to be attained not through a form but through a process. So according to this view there is no harm in giving the Constitution of a Muslim Republic the name of *the Constitution of an Islamic Republic* if there exist possibilities of its actually evolving into an *Islamic* Constitution in the future.

According to the realistic and practical viewpoint, it is contrary to the spirit of Islam to make exaggerated claims. A good Muslim ought constantly to seek the forgiveness of God for his human failings, weaknesses and shortcomings (e.g., his self-interest, ambition, greed, corruption, social immorality and lack of even elementary honesty). He should avoid making exaggerated claims and conduct himself with sincerity, honesty, humility and modesty. He must not waste his breath in vain boasting but should devote himself entirely to silent creativity. It is the *Deed* and not the *Idea* which makes a Muslim. Thus the actualisation of Islam as a social ideal is only possible if Islam is brought directly into operation through the Constitution. The mere making of an exaggerated claim cannot lead to the solution of any problem. It is bound to lead to cynicism, disintegration and chaos. It was only because our Constitutions were not *Islamic* in a definite sense that the *Islamic State* idea appeared to peter out and was neglected and frustrated, leading to a mood of disillusionment in some circles.

During the past, some of the political leaders of this country did not hesitate to use Islam for their own selfish ends. Everyone who has gone through the Munir Committee Report (1954) is aware of this unfortunate fact. So according to this view the Constitution of a Muslim Republic cannot claim itself to be *Islamic* unless and until it actually brings Islam into operation (and does not defer its operation into the future). Otherwise the claim of the people who adopt such a Constitution is merely a hollow claim far removed from reality.

How then may the State in Pakistan be Islamized?

National and Provincial Assemblies to interpret the Law of Islam

It has already been noted that in Islam the spiritual and the temporal are not two separate domains. The nature of an act, even if secular in import, is determined by the attitude of mind with which the agent does it. Since each generation is to solve its own problems, there is no reason why the power to interpret the law of Islam should not be given to the National and Provincial Assemblies.

Indeed the present-day Muslim Assemblies would consist of members who possessed little knowledge of the subtleties of Islamic

law. But that should not embarrass us as long as we are able to produce the kind of men who rely on their healthy instincts and in the words of Iqbal, have "the courage to rush into sun-lit space and do, even by force, what the new conditions of life demanded. Such men are liable to make mistakes; but the history of nations shows that even their mistakes have sometimes borne good fruit. In them it is not logic but life that struggles restlessly to solve its own problems."[11]

Reform in the System of Legal Instruction

Anyway, if there exist possibilities of erroneous interpretation, then our present system of Islamic legal instruction may be reformed, and its sphere should be extended to include a careful study of modern jurisprudence.

If the study of Islamic law in the light of modern jurisprudence is encouraged in our institutions of legal instruction, then it would lead to the emergence of a group of lawyers who would be trained to interpret the law of Islam in the light of modern experience and the changed conditions of modern life. The presence of such lawyers as members of the Assemblies would certainly reduce the possibilities of erroneous interpretation of the law of Islam.

Additional Powers of the Supreme Court

Those judges of the Supreme Court who have been specially trained in the knowledge of the principal sources and the branches of Islamic jurisprudence and who have also been trained in the application of the rules derived from those sources to modern problems, should be given special powers to determine, after such hearing (of the *Ulema* as well as the *Experts*) as they think fit, whether the legislative activity of the National and Provincial Assemblies was in conformity with or repugnant to the Injunctions of Islam.

Any problem of Islamic law which the President considers of public importance and which requires reinterpretation in the light of modern experience should be put to these judges by the National or Provincial Assembly through the President in the form of a Reference; and they should report their opinion on such matters to the

President. This is the only method by which the *Fatwa* could be successfully revived in modern times.

As for examining the existing laws with a view to bringing them into conformity with the teachings of Islam, this objective can only be realised through a commission of experienced jurists. The compilations of Islamic law like *Fatawa-i-Alamgiri*and *Mujelle* were made by such commissions of jurists appointed by the Mughal Emperor Aurangzeb and the Ottoman Sultan Sulaiman. Therefore, the President should appoint a commission consisting of retired judges of the Supreme Court for this purpose. The commission, after making recommendations in this respect within a specified period, must submit its report to the President who should lay it before the National Assembly and the National Assembly after considering the report should enact laws in respect thereof.

It is also suggested that the judges of the High Court and the Supreme Court should be made to wear the robes which the Islamic tradition has specified and sanctioned for them. Instead of the robes which are worn by our judges at present, they should wear the *Jubbah* and the *Amamah* (gown and turban).

The interpreters of Law in Islam have always been regarded as the successors of the Holy Prophet, and this dress has been associated with them. In fact the West took the *gown* and the *staff* from the Muslims as symbols of academic and legal authority. But the *wig*, instead of the *turban*, comes from the Middle Ages of Christian Europe.

Establishment of the Ministry of Religious Affairs, Ideological Orientation or Awqaf.

The other very important reform which ought to be accomplished in this connection is the establishment of a department of Religious Affairs or Ideological Orientation—like the other executive departments of the Government. This department should work under the Ministry of Religious Affairs, Ideological Orientation or Awqaf.

This Ministry should take into possession all the mosques of Pakistan. Its duties should include the management and organisation as well as repair and construction of the mosques. It should be authorised to appoint the *Imams of the Mosque*. The status of these *Imams* must be similar to that of the other civil servants. They should derive fixed salaries (and come under civil servants' law and rules), and be provided with licences from the Government to lead the *Juma*, *Eidan* and *daily* congregational prayers as well as to preach or to deliver the *Khutba* (sermon) in the mosques. No unlicensed person should be permitted to preach or to deliver the *Khutba* in any mosque of Pakistan. To do this should be made a criminal offence punishable under the Penal Code.

The object in the above suggestion is by no means to restrict the freedom of speech or the right to express opinion in religious matters. But subject to law, public order and morality every citizen should retain the freedom of speech or the right to express opinion in religious matters, except that no unlicensed authority should be allowed to preach or deliver the *Khutba* in the mosques of Pakistan. If the State were to organise the Mosques and to appoint the *Imams* of the two major sects of Islam (***Sunni*** and ***Shia***), it would undoubtedly help in eliminating Sectarianism from the collective life of the Muslim Community. The smaller sects of Islam could be encouraged to establish their autonomous institutions for this purpose with the recognition and sanction of the State.

The objection can be raised that if the State were to appoint the *Imams of the Mosque*, then just as in the past some political leaders of this country have used the executive agencies of the State as well as the Police for their selfish ends, so in the future they may also use the *state-appointed Imams* as an additional and a very powerful weapon, and compel them to deliver only such sermons to the people which suit their requirements.

In this connection it is submitted that our claim is that *Religion* and *State* are one in Pakistan. We must not hesitate, therefore, to make *Religion* a vital organ of our *State* for the reason that we are afraid lest the *State* starts using *Religion* for its selfish ends. Have we ever thought in terms of abolishing the executive organs of the State or the Police because a few political leaders have used, or

are likely to use, these State agencies for their personal ends? Never. No State can be run without its executive organs and the Police. The State employees owe their allegiance to the State, and they are not permitted to take part in the political life of the country. There are numerous instances when the State employees or Police officers refused to comply with the illegal demands of the *delinquent* politicians. Why should it be assumed that the *state-appointed Imams* would serve as tools in the hands of the *delinquent* politicians? They too, like the other civil servants, would owe their allegiance to the State, and would not be allowed to take part in the political life of the country.

Everything which relates to our collective life (Food, Health, Education etc.) is an integral part and exists as a vital organ of our State; but it is rather unfortunate that in spite of our claim that *Religion* and *State* are one in Pakistan, Islam is not made an integral part and does not exist as a vital organ of our State. A Doctor or a Lawyer cannot pursue his profession in Pakistan unless he possesses a licence or is registered, but there is no such condition for the *Imam of the Mosque*. In our villages a *Patwari* commands greater respect than an *Imam of the Mosque*, only because he is a State employee whereas the poor *Imam* is not.

It has been noted that when the Indian sub-continent was under Muslim rule, Islam was a vital organ of the State for only the Central Executive Authority (*the Padshah*) appointed the Judges (*Quzzat*) who were authorised to perform the duties of the *Imams of the Mosque* in addition to dispensing civil and criminal justice. (According to the Islamic tradition the performance of the duties of the *Imams of the Mosque* by the *Judges* is a practice of antiquity. But in numerous Muslim countries the Head of the State appointed persons other than the *Judges* to perform the duties of the *Imams of the Mosque*. In Baghdad, for instance, the Caliph always appointed different persons as *Judges* and as *Imams of the Mosque*. It was only the Head of the State who was authorised to make such appointments because to *rule*, to *judge*, and to *lead the congregational prayers* were originally the duties of the Head of the State, who delegated his powers to others as the State expanded.)

At any rate, the British excluded Islam from the State in the Indian sub-continent for obvious reasons. Now the unfortunate position is that in spite of our freedom, in spite of our being Muslims, and in spite of our claim that *Religion* and *State* are one in Pakistan, it is not really and actually so, but on the contrary, we have become so accustomed to some of the institutions of the period of our subjugation that we are afraid at the very thought of making our *Religion* a vital organ of our *State*.

In Christian countries, although the State is run on the principle of Secularism, the spiritual or religious matters are left entirely in the hands of the Ecclesiastic hierarchy, which looks after and administers the Churches etc. through its own agencies. It is, however, obviously impossible to establish an Ecclesiastic hierarchy (or a Church organisation) in Pakistan because the separation of *Church* and *State* is unthinkable to a Muslim. But since the religion of Islam has always been one of the vital organs of the State in our past history, it is necessary that it should become so in Pakistan; otherwise our claim that *Religion* and *State* are one in Pakistan, is absolutely baseless and without any foundation. (One of the Directive Principles of the State Policy under the 1956 Constitution was that "the State shall endeavour, as respects the Muslims of Pakistan, to secure the proper organisation of *Zakat*, *Wakfs* and Mosques."—Article 25 (2) (d). Similarly, one of the Principles of Policy under the 1962 Constitution was that "the proper organisation of *Zakat*, *Wakfs* and mosques should be ensured"—Article 8 (1 A) (4). This implies that the framers of the two Constitutions were aware of the necessity of organising the *Mosques* etc. But it seems that they had no clear idea of how to accomplish this reform).

It is also necessary that the *Imams of the Mosque* should be granted certain special powers of the *Qazi*. For instance, they should be authorised to give sanction to the marriage tie, to perform the marriage ceremony and record such ceremonial performances in a regularly maintained Register. If possible in every mosque there should be established an office of the *Imam*. The *Imam* must look after the mosque and it should be one of his duties to provide means, for the comfort and convenience of those who come to offer prayers there. The *Imam* should be empowered to employ servants to assist him in the performance of his duties. He should perform his duties

without any remuneration (other than his salary). When the Faculty of Theology is established and starts functioning in our Universities it should be made a condition that the *Imams of the Mosques* must be graduates of Theology from our State-recognised Universities.

The *Imams of the Mosque* should be trained *social workers*. They should assist the people in solving their difficulties and problems particularly in rural areas. In their spare time they should teach children and adults in the villages, assist in building clean and hygienic houses, wells, roads etc. They should work in the fields and assist in the programmes of medical relief or other development programmes. In short, they should demonstrate to the peasants and workers their feeling of equality and solidarity with them, their dedication and their willingness to work.

The Department of Social Welfare (which is at present affiliated to the Ministry of Health) should be brought under this Ministry.

The Ministry of Religious Affairs, Ideological Orientation or Awqaf should take into possession all the Muslim religious endowments (*awqaf*) in Pakistan and appoint administrators to manage them. It should take into possession all the Monasteries (*Khanqahs* etc.) or tombs of the Saints in Pakistan and appoint administrators to manage them. There is no denying the fact that the mystical orders produced Saints of a very high quality in the world of Islam. At one time these Monasteries were the centres of attraction for the *Learned*. But now their condition is very deplorable indeed. They have been transformed into centres of moral and religious corruption. Modern Islam cannot tolerate the presence of mediaeval mysticism. Such mysticism robbed the Muslims of their healthy instincts and gave them only obscure thinking in return.

"The masses of Islam" says Iqbal, "were swayed by the kind of mysticism which blinked actualities, enervated the people and kept them steeped in all kinds of superstition. From its high state as a force of spiritual education, mysticism had fallen down to a mere means of exploiting the ignorance and credulity of the people. It gradually and invisibly unnerved the will of Islam and softened it to the extent of seeking relief from the religious discipline of the law of Islam. The 19th Century Muslim reformers rose in revolt against

this mysticism and called Muslims to the broad day-light of the modern world. Not that they were materialists. Their mission was to open the eyes of the Muslims to the spirit of Islam which aimed at the conquest of matter and not flight from it."[12]

Thus it is high time that the *Mutawallis, Mujawars, Sahibzadas. Gaddi-Nashins, Sajjada-Nashins, Pirs* etc., connected with the Monasteries or the tombs of the Saints, should either be reformed or removed from their self-created spiritual offices.

The establishment of such a Ministry on the lines suggested above is the only remedy for the paralysing influence of the *Mullah* and the *Pir* over the rural and urban masses of Islam. Unless and until the *Mullah* and the *Pir* are excluded from our religious life, there is no likelihood of the successful dissemination of enlightenment, liberalism and a meaningful and vital Faith among the people of Pakistan. If Islam could become a vital organ of the State on the lines suggested above, any forthcoming Constitution, based on any form of democracy, would be, to a very great extent, justified in claiming itself to be *Islamic* even if it did not bear the name of the *Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.*

CHAPTER 4

DUTIES OF THE STATE AND THOSE OF THE INDIVIDUAL TO THE STATE

According to Islamic Constituitonal Theory Absolute Sovereignty over the entire Universe belongs to God[1]; but since Man has been appointed God's representative (*Khalifah*) on Earth[2], earthly sovereignty vests in him as a sacred trust from God. (It is only in this sense that a Muslim State claims itself to be sovereign).

There are no limits prescribed to the authority to be exercised by Man so long as he does not repeal, abrogate, or supersede the Law of God (or the Injunctions of Islam). Consequently a Muslim Assembly (*Ijma*) *cannot repeal the Quran, althought it has the power to extend or limit the application of a Quranic rule of law* in the circumstances when such extension or limitation is sanctioned under a *Shari'a* value (*Hukm*).

If the Companions have unanimously decided a particular point, are the later generations bound by their decision? Iqbal maintains: "I think it is necessary in this connection to discriminate between a decision relaitng to a question of fact and the one relating to a question of law. In the former case, as for instance, when the question arose whether the two small *suras* known as 'Muavazatain' formed part of the Quran or not, and the Companions unanimously decided that they did, we are bound by their decision, obviously because the Companions alone were in a position to know the fact. In the latter case the question is one of interpretation only, and, I venture to think, on the authority of Karkhi, that later generations are not bound by the decisions of the Companions. Says Karkhi: 'The Sunnah of the Companions is binding in matters which cannot be cleared up by *Qiyas*, but it is not so in matters which can be established by *Qiyas*.'"[3]

The first and the foremost duty of the State then, is, its *Duty to God*. It must preserve, protect and defend the Law of God. All the

persons who exercise authority on behalf of the State, therefore, are individually and collectively answerable to God. They must faithfully perform the duties of their offices, bear true allegiance to the State, and preserve, protect and defend the laws of the State.

What are the duties of the State to the people? "The essence of *Tauhid* (Unity of God) as a working idea" says Iqbal, "is equality, solidarity, and freedom. The State from the Islamic standpoint, is an endeavour to transform these ideals into space-time forces, an aspiration to realise them in a definite human organisation."[4]

Endeavour to achieve the Ideal of Equality

All men are created equal. God says in the Quran: "O mankind; Be careful of your duty to your Lord who created you from a single soul and from it created its mate and spread from these two many men and women."[5]

The State from the standpoint of Islam, therefore, should endeavour to realise equality of status and opportunity among the people. It should provide basic necessities of life such as food clothing, housing, education, medical relief and employment to all such citizens as are permanently unable to earn their livelihood on account of infirmity, sickness or unemployment. It should provide facilities of work and adequate livelihood, and secure just and humane conditions of work. It should provide social security and make provisions for securing the well-being of the people irrespective of caste, creed and race.

It should remove illiteracy and provide free and compulsory education for everybody. It should adopt means for technical and other forms of training for the people and facilitate industrial development so that the people could participate fully in all forms of national activity, and employment in the different spheres of life. It should achieve parity in various classes of administrative services and enable everybody to take part in the Defence Service.

God says in the Quran: "O you who believe: be maintainers of justice, bearers of witness for God's sake, though it may be against your own selves, or (your) parents or near relatives; if he be

rich or poor, God is most competent (to deal) with them both; therefore do not follow (your) low desires, lest you deviate; and if you swerve or turn aside, then surely God is aware of what you do.[6]" So in the eyes of Islamic law the rich man does not enjoy any advantage over the poor man, or the sovereign over his subject. The State from the Islamic standpoint, therefore, must endeavour to achieve equality of all its citizens before law. It should administer criminal, civil, social, economic and political justice in all the spheres of the people's life.

From the standpoint of Islam, the State is responsible for maintaining a fair distribution of wealth among all its citizens. God says in the Quran: "And let not those who hoard up that which God has bestowed upon them of His bounty think that it is better for them. Nay, it is worse for them. That which they hoard will be their halter on the Day of Resurrection."

Thus the State should prevent the concentration of wealth and means of production and distribution in the hands of a few to the detriment of the interest of the many. It should ensure just and equitable adjustment of rights between the employers and the employees and landlords and tenants.

Since Islam's attitude towards other religions is more than that of mere tolerance, the freedom of religious belief and practice has always been guaranteed, and the Islamic State, in the past, has never interfered with or declared any of the institutions and customs of the non-Muslims *null* and *void*. God says in the Quran: "There is no compulsion in religion; truly the right way has become clearly distinct from error."[8] and: "And if thy Lord has pleased, all those who are in the earth would have believed, all of them. Wilt thou then force men till they are believers?"[9]

Thus the State, from the standpoint of Islam, should make adequate provision for the non-Muslims to profess freely and practise their religion. It should safeguard their legitimate rights and interests and allow them to develop their culture.

Endeavour to achieve the Ideal of Solidarity

God desires the Muslims to regard themselves as brothers, for He says in the Quran: "Only the faithful are brethren."[10] If there exists racial, linguistic and territorial diversity among the Muslims, it is merely for the purpose of identification, for God makes it abundantly clear: "The best among you in the eye of God is he who is the purest in life."[11] He says to the Muslims: "Hold fast, all of you together, to the rope of God, and do not scatter. And remember God's Goodness towards you, how that when you were enemies, He united your hearts and by His favour you became brethren."[12]

Thus the State, from the standpoint of Islam, should see that the regional languages and cultures of the Muslims are preserved only for the purpose of identification and not for shattering the unity and solidarity on which the Muslim Community is founded. The State should discourage tribal, racial, provincial and sectarian prejudices among the citizens, because they are contrary to the spirit of Islam.

The State should take steps to enable the Muslims to order their lives in accordance with the teachings and requirements of Islam. It should make instruction in the Quran compulsory in the State-run educational institutions and promote the observance of Islamic moral standards. It should discourage expensive living among the Muslims and abolish customs under which large sums of money are wasted by the Muslims (e.g., the giving of dowry at marriages). It should secure the proper organisation of *Zakat*, religious endowments (*awqaf*), Monasteries (*Khanqas*) and Mosques through its own agencies.

God says to the Muslims: "And let there be (formed) of you a community inviting to good, urging what is reputable and restraining from what is disreputable."[13] The State, therefore, should persuade the Muslims to do what is reputable or right (*ma'ruf*) and to detect, restrain and punish what is disreputable or wrong (*munkar*) under the Law of God. It should prevent prostitution, gambling and the taking of injurious drugs. It should also prevent the consumption of alcoholic liquor, forbid the taking of interest on money loaned (*riba*), and speculation.

The State should safeguard and defend the territorial integrity of the country, its independence and all its rights including its sovereign rights over land, sea and air.

In the Indian sub-continent, the Muslims did not secure territorial specification on racial and linguistic grounds. Pakistan came into being because Islam sought for a *State* in which to implement its social order. Thus although every Muslim citizen of Pakistan feels bound to lay down his life for his country, ideally he has always believed and still believes that Pakistan is founded on the principle of *Muslim nationalism* which means that each and every Muslim country should be emancipated from foreign rule, irrespective of race or language, and this emancipation must not come into conflict with the basic principles of *equality, solidarity* and *freedom* among the Muslims as established by their religious usage and cultural coherence.

Iqbal maintains that the *Hijrah* (migration) of the Holy Prophet from his birthplace, Mecca, to Medinah reveals the real secret of the Muslims' conception of *Nationalism* i.e., the Muslims are bound together not by geographical ties but by the ties of their communal brotherhood. Islam emphasises the necessity for the founding of the Muslim Community anywhere in the world. It is probably for this reason that the Islamic era (*Hijrah*) begins from the time when the Holy Prophet and his followers migrated from Mecca to Medinah and established an autonomous socio-political order there. Consequently the *Hijrah* (the Islamic era), as W.C. Smith also observes, did not begin from the date of birth of the Holy Prophet (as is the Christian case), neither did it begin from the death of the Holy Prophet, nor from the year when the revelations of the Quran began to descend on the Holy Prophet, "but from the year when the nascent Muslim Community came to political power."[14] This fact makes it abundantly clear that the founding of the *politically free Community* is basic in Islam and that each Muslim receives his identity not because he belongs to a particular race, tribe, caste, colour, linguistic group or territory, but because he belongs to the Muslim Community.

When, on the basis of Islam, Iqbal yearned for the establishment of an *independent Muslim State* in the Indian sub-continent, he had, at the back of his mind, a desire to facilitate the realisation of the dream of Jamaluddin Afghani i.e., the creation of a *Union of Muslim*

States. In other words, through the creation of Pakistan, Iqbal's object was to bring into actuality *Islamistan*, the vision which he had derived from his conception of International Islam. This is probably the reason why Iqbal did not suggest any name for the free and independent *Muslim State* which he desired to see created in the Indian sub-continent.

At any rate, since Islam is the basis on which Pakistan is founded, the State should strengthen the bonds of unity among Muslim countries. It should, at the same time, promote international peace and security to foster good and friendly relations among all the nations of the world, for Islam stands for peace, the God of Islam is Peace[15], and a Muslim ends his prayer by invoking peace on his right as well as on his left.

Endeavour to achieve the Ideal of Freedom

Man, from the standpoint of Islam, is created free. There are no fetters on his liberty of thought and action. God has granted him the faculties of hearing, seeing, feeling and understanding, and He has put before him the right and the wrong path, but has left the freedom of choice with Man. God says in the Quran: "And say: The truth is from your Lord: Let him then, who will, believe: and let him who will, be an unbeliever."[16] And again: "If you do well to your own behoof will ye do well: and if you do evil against yourselves will ye do it."[17] Thus Man cannot bear the burden of another and is entitled to only what is due to his own personal effort. God makes it abundantly clear in the Quran: "That no bearer of burden shall bear the burden of another, and that man shall have nothing but what he strives for."[18] The initiative, therefore, is entirely in the hands of Man. He is responsible for his own actions, for if he desires to change his own condition he must strive for it. God says: "Surely God does not change the condition of a people until they change their own condition."[19]

The State, from the standpoint of Islam, therefore, must guarantee the liberty of Man. It should guarantee Man's fundamental rights, e.g., equality of status and of opportunity, equality before law, freedom of thought and expression, belief, faith, worship, association, assembly, movement, trade, business or profession

and right to hold and dispose of property, subject to law and public morality. The State must secure the complete independence of the Judiciary.

In the light of the above, the form of the State which comes nearest to the spirit of Islam is what is called a truly democratic State in modern constitutional jurisprudence. The basis of Government according to Islam is, 'General Consultation' among the Muslims (*Al-Shura*). God says in the Quran: "And those who respond to their Lord and keep up prayer, and their rule is to take counsel among themselves."[20] Even the Holy Prophet is urged by God to consult the believers, for God says: "Therefore, forgive and ask for pardon for them, and consult them in the affairs."[21] Thus the State, from the standpoint of Islam, should be a democratic State. It must exercise its powers and authority only through the chosen representatives of the people.

Duties of the Individual to the State

The first and foremost duty of the individual to the State is *loyalty and allegiance* to the State and respect for the laws of the State. God says in the Quran: "Obey God, His Apostle and those who command authority over you."[22] The object in this verse is to make the individual realise that if he were not to render obedience to the 'leaders of the Community' who exercise authority on behalf of the State, it would lead to disruption and chaos. The 'leaders of the Community' in the Islamic sense would be the constitutionally elected Head of the State, the chosen representatives of the people, the jurists, judges, the State officials, the military commanders etc. The rendering of obedience to the 'leaders of the Community' implies the rendering of obedience to the State, and since the State, from the standpoint of Islam, must preserve, protect and defend the Law of God, as was done by God's Apostle, the rendering of obedience to the State automatically implies the rendering of obedience to God and His Apostle.

The next important duty of the individual to the State is to *co-operate* with the 'leaders of the Community' and to put them right in case they are led astray. God says to the Muslims: "Help one another in goodness and piety and do not help one another in sin

and aggression."[23] The Holy Prophet is reported to have said: "My Community would never agree on an error." When Abu Bakr was elected Caliph, he said in his inaugural address to the people: "I have been put in this office to conduct your affairs, although I am in no way superior to you. If I do right, help me; if I go wrong, put me right."

It is only through the rendering of obedience and co-operation of the individuals, in the sense explained, that the State could preserve, protect and defend the Law of God.

CHAPTER 5.

FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS

The Fundamental Rights of the individual were guaranteed in written form, for the first time, under the Constitution of the United States of America. Thus, in this matter, the hundred and fifty years' old United States Constitution is generally thought to have furnished a model for the rest of the world.

Thomas Jefferson, the third President of the United States is reported to have said: "We must hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government laying its foundation on such principles, and organising its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

Unfortunately the study of Islamic law in the light of modern jurisprudence has not yet been encouraged in Muslim countries. Had it been so, the Muslim jurists would have shown to the world that the fundamental, inalienable and residual rights of Man were guaranteed in written form, under the Quran, long before the United States Constitution was conceived, long before the American continent was discovered; nay, even long before modern Western civilisation was born.

To the Muslim, the fundamental rights guaranteed to Man under the Quran are sacred. They cannot be obscured or eradicated by any mortal power, for they constitute the *Spoken Word* of God, and are written, to borrow a phrase from Hamilton, "as with a sunbeam, by the hand of divinity itself."

The strength of the Muslim Community lies in the strength of the law of Islam. The Islamic law provides to each individual (male as well as female) a full legal status, mainly because it is based on the principle of the liberty and security of Man. A Muslim individual can enjoy his rights under the Quran so long as he does not neglect or fail to discharge his duty to his fellow beings. In other words, he can exercise his rights, and enjoy his freedom, as he pleases, within the limits which the law of Islam has prescribed. His freedom is, therefore, regulated in the common interest of the Community as a whole.

To a Muslim, the law of Islam is the Will of the God of Islam who enjoins certain acts and forbids others. Thus the Muslim, as the bondsman of God, is the slave of His Law in order that he may be free. His liberty is safeguarded under his right to do whatever the law of Islam permits. Any form of Collectivism, therefore, which claims to order human life in all its principal activities through the State instead of the individual being a free agent, is contrary to the spirit of Islam.

Since *freedom* is one of the important ingredients of *Tauhid* (Unity of God), the State, from the standpoint of Islam, cannot be any other than democratic or republican. It may assume the form of a parliamentary, cabinet or presidential system; the method of representation which lays the responsibility on the elected representatives of the people is definitely essential for achieving the ideal of *freedom* as understood by Islam.

The State which is governed under the Islamic Law is called *Darul Islam* (the Abode of Peace), obviously because it guarantees the security of the person and the property of the individual in order that no Man should feel afraid of another. It safeguards the security of the individual's life, property, family, marriage, children, public worship, thought, expression, character, reputation, movement, trade and occupation; and constantly aims at preserving that security by restraining or punishing those who violate it.

The State, from the Islamic standpoint, therefore, must neither interfere with the person and property of the individual (except through due process of law) nor permit anybody to invade the

liberty of the other by imprisoning him or by stripping him of his property without lawful authority.

The law of Islam and the Muslim Community are interdependent and complementary institutions. The Muslim Community accepts the imposition of the Law upon itself not in order to curtail its liberty, but to realise what it believes to be its own beneficial development. Governmental control and authority, from the standpoint of Islam, therefore, must be used for the beneficial development of the Community as a whole; and the State must constantly endeavour to secure the reconciliation of the liberty of the individual with the authority of the Government in such a way that the freedom of the individual is preserved and, at the same time, a good standard of life for all the citizens is maintained.

Since in modern societies virtue is left to be enforced by educational or corrective institutions, the influence of public opinion or the free wisdom of Man's will, it is not the function of Law to impose morality. Modern legislatures, therefore, confine themselves to expressing only civil obligations and the punishment instituted against criminal offences.

The State, from the standpoint of Islam, should enforce the rule of law. It must not deprive any individual of his life, liberty or property without notice and an opportunity of being heard. The God of Islam has made human life sacred, and Islam regards private ownership as a trust. God says in the Quran: "And that ye slay not the life when God hath made it sacred, save in the course of justice."[1] He also says: "And eat not up your property among yourselves in vanity, nor seek by it to gain the hearing of the judges that ye may knowingly devour a portion of the property of others wrongfully."[2] In his last sermon, the Holy Prophet is reported to have said: "Your lives and property are sacred and inviolable one to another until you appear before your Lord."

Thus the security of the person and the property of the individual has been guaranteed to the individual under the Law of God. The State, from the standpoint of Islam, therefore, must guarantee to all citizens their fundamental rights. It should guarantee the equality of all citizens before law, and provide equal protection of law to

everybody. No person should be deprived of life or liberty except in accordance with law, and no person should be punished for an act which was not punishable by law, nor should any person be subjected to a punishment greater than that fixed by law for an offence. No person should be detained in custody without notice of the grounds for his arrest, nor should any person be denied the right to consult or be defended by a legal practitioner of his choice. Similarly, no person should be deprived of his property except in accordance with law, and no property should be requisitioned or taken possession of except by the authority of law which provides for compensation thereof.

It has already been pointed out that *equality* and *freedom* are two of the basic ingredients of *Tauhid* (Unity of God), and that the idea of the State, from the standpoint of Islam, implies a constant endeavour to realise these ideals in a definite human organisation. *Equality* and *freedom* are the sacred rights of Man, guaranteed to him under the Law of God. The State, therefore, must guarantee to all citizens equality before law, as well as equality of status and opportunity. No person should be permitted to practice untouchability, and no person should be held in slavery. There should be no discrimination in respect to the right of the individual to have access to public places, and similarly the right of the individual should be safeguarded against discrimination in services.

It has been noted that Man is created free. God says in the Quran: "It is He who has made the earth manageable for you, so travel ye through its tracts and enjoy of the sustenance which He furnishes; but unto Him is the Resurrection."[3] The State, from the standpoint of Islam, therefore, must guarantee everybody the right to pursue happiness, to freedom of speech and expression, subject to any reasonable restrictions imposed by law in the interest of the Community as a whole and the security of the country. Subject to any reasonable restrictions imposed by law in the public interest, every citizen should be guaranteed the right of freedom of assembly and association, of freedom of movement, of trade, business and profession, and the right to hold and dispose of property.

God says in the Quran: "If God had not raised a group toward off the others from aggression, churches, synagogues, oratories, and

mosques where God is worshipped most, would have been destroyed."[4] The State, from the standpoint of Islam, therefore, must offer equal protection and security to all the religions in the country because the God of Islam enjoins not only tolerance of all the religions other than Islam but the Muslims are obliged even to defend the places of worship of the non-Muslims under their protection.

There are numerous instances in Islamic history of Muslim tolerance and of the Muslims defending the places of worship of the non-Muslims. The Holy Prophet himself has set before us an illuminating example. Once a deputation of Christians waited upon him, and while he was in conversation with them in his own mosque at Medinah, the time for the Christian prayer approached. Accordingly the Christians brought this fact to the notice of the Holy Prophet and proposed to move out of the mosque; but the Holy Prophet asked them: "Why don't you pray here?" They replied: "Our prayer is accompanied with instrumental music and it may be disapproved of, if so conducted in the mosque." The Holy Prophet said: "Pray as you like in your own way," and so the Christians held their service in their own way in the mosque of the Holy Prophet. Such was his tolerance.

When Umar, the second Caliph, visited Jerusalem (Palestine), he called on the Bishop of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and while he was talking to him, the time for prayer intervened. Umar said to the Bishop: "Forgive me for it is my prayer-time and therefore I must go out and offer prayers." The Bishop said to him: "You could pray here instead of going out for this is also a house of prayer." Umar replied: "You are right and we can pray anywhere on God's earth but my praying here is fraught with the danger lest the Muslims in my life-time or after claim a right to convert this church into a mosque on the grounds that I have prayed in it." Thereupon Umar went out and offered prayers on the steps of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.

These examples indicate that Islam not only preaches but also demonstrates by practice that it stands for the complete liberty of all creeds. The State, from the standpoint of Islam, therefore, must guarantee every citizen the right to profess, practise and propagate his religion subject to law, public order and morality; it should gua-

rantee every religious sect the right to establish, maintain and manage its religious and educational institutions.

No person should be forced to pay any special tax the proceeds of which are to be spent on the propagation or maintenance of any religion other than his own. No person should be denied admission to any educational institution on the ground of race, religion or caste. No person attending any educational institution should be required to receive religious instruction if such instruction relates to a religion other than his own. Any group of citizens having a distinct language, script or culture should have the right to preserve the same.

The State must not make any law the effect of which is to curtail, take away or abridge the fundamental rights guaranteed to all the citizens. All laws inconsistent with or in derogation of the fundamental rights must be declared null and void. The State must guarantee all citizens the right to remedies, e.g., the right to move the High Court by appropriate proceedings, for the enforcement of their fundamental rights, and the High Court must be authorised to issue to any person, authority or Government, directions, orders, or writs for the enforcement of any of the fundamental rights.

It is only through guaranteeing the enforcement of the fundamental rights of each and every citizen that the Muslim Community shall be enabled to retain the vision of a more perfect State, which it can endeavour to reach under the guidance of the Law of God. The adoption of the symbols of *the Crescent* and *the Star* on the national flag represents this very aspiration of the Muslim Community i.e., the State to achieve gradually (just as the Crescent moon passing through its numerous phases, eventually achieves) perfection under the guidance of God's Law (symbolised on the national flag as the Guiding Star). The following basic rights of Man can be directly traced from the Quran and Sunnah:

(1) Equality of all citizens before law as well as equality of status and opportunity.

"O Mankind; Be careful of your duty to your Lord who created you from a single soul and from it created its mate, and spread from these two many men and women" (4; verse 1).

"Lo! Pharaoh exalted himself in the earth and divided its people into castes. A group among them he oppressed, killing their sons and sparing their women. Lo! He was of those who work corruption". (28; verse 4).

(2) Freedom of Religion.

"There is no compulsion in the matter of religion" (2; verse 256).

"And if thy Lord had pleased, all those who are in the earth would have believed, all of them. Wilt thou then force men till they are believers"? (10; verse 99).

"Had Allah willed, idolat rs had not been idolatrous. We have not set thee as a keeper over them, nor art thou responsible for them". (6; verse 108).

"And argue not with the People of the Book unless it be in a way that is fair, save with such of them as do wrong; and say: We believe in that which hath been revealed unto us and revealed unto you; our God and your God is One, and unto Him we surrender". (29; verse 46).

"If God had not raised a group (Muslims) to ward off the others from aggression, churches, synagogues, oratories and mosques where God is worshipped most, would have been destroyed". (22; verse 40).

(3) The Right to Life.

"And slay not the life which Allah hath forbidden save for justice". (17; verse 33).

(4) The Right to Property.

"And eat not up your property among yourselves in vanity, nor seek by it to gain the hearing of the judges that ye may knowingly devour a portion of the property of others wrongfully". (2; verse 188).

(5) No one is to suffer for the wrongs of another.

"Each should earneth on its own account, nor doth any laden bear another's load". (6; verse 165).

"Whosoever goeth right, it is only for the good of his own soul that he goeth right, and whosoever erreth, erreth only to its hurt. No laden soul can bear another's load (17; verse 15).

"That no laden one shall bear the burden of another". (53; verse 38).

(6) Freedom of Person.

Inferred from the Sunnah by Imam Khattabi and Imam Abu Yusuf. A *Tradition* is reported by Abu Daud to the effect that some persons were arrested on suspicion in Medinah in the times of the Holy Prophet. Subsequently, while the Holy Prophet was delivering the Friday Sermon (*Khutba*), a Companion enquired of him as to why and on what grounds had these persons been arrested. The Holy Prophet maintained silence while the question was repeated twice, thus giving an opportunity to the prosecutor, who was present there, to explain the position. When the question was put for the third time and it again failed to elicit a reply from the prosecutor, the Holy Prophet ordered that those persons should be released. On the basis of this *Tradition*, Imam Khattabi argues in his *M'alimul Sunnan* that Islam recognises only two kinds of detention: (*a*) Under the orders of the Court, and (*b*) For the purposes of investigation. There is no other ground on which a person could be deprived of his freedom. Imam Abu Yusuf maintains in his *Kitabul Kharaj* on the authority of the same *Tradition*, that no one can be imprisoned on false or unproved charges. Caliph Umar is reported to have said: "In Islam no one can be imprisoned without due course of justice". (Imam Malik's, *Muwatta*).

(7) Freedom of Opinion.

"Allah loveth not the utterance of harsh speech save by one who hath been wronged". (4; verse 148).

"Those of the children of Israel who went astray were cursed by the tongue of David, and of Jesus, son of Mary. That was because they rebelled and used to transgress".

"They restrained not one another from the wickedness they did. Varily evil was that they used to do". (5; verse 78-79).

"And when they forgot that whereof they had been reminded. We rescued those who forbade wrong, and visited those who did wrong with dreadful punishment because they were evil-livers". (7; verse 165).

"Ye are the best community that hath been raised up for mankind. Ye enjoin right and forbid wrong". (3; verse 110).

(8) Freedom of Movement.

"It is He who has made the earth manageable for you, so travel ye through its tracts and enjoy of the sustenance which He furnishes; but unto Him is the Resurrection". (67; verse 15).

(9) Freedom of Association.

"And let there be formed of you a community inviting to good, urging what is reputable and restraining from what is disreputable". (3; verse 104).

(10) The Right to Privacy.

"O ye who believe! Enter no houses other than your own without first announcing your presence and invoking peace upon the folk thereof. That is better for you, that ye may be heedful".

"And if ye find no one therein, still enter not until permission hath been given. And if it be said unto you: Go away again, then go away, for it is purer for you. Allah knoweth what ye do". (24; verse 27-28).

"And spy not, neither backbite one another. Would one of you love to eat the flesh of his dead brother? Ye abhor that so abhor the other!". (49; verse 12).

(11) The Right to secure basic necessities of life.

"And let not those who hoard up that which God has bestowed upon them of His bounty think that it is better for them. Nay, it is worst for them. That which they hoard will be their halter on the Day of Resurrection". (3; verse 180).

"And in the wealth of the haves there is due share of the have-nots". (51; verse 19).

(12) The Right to Reputation.

"Neither defame one another, nor insult one another by nicknames. Bad is the name of lewdness after faith. O ye who believe! Shun much suspicion; for lo! some suspicion is a crime." (49; verse 11-12).

"And those who malign believing men and believing women undeservedly, they bear the guilt of slander and manifest sin". (33; verse 58).

(13) The Right to a hearing.

Inferred from the Sunnah. The Holy Prophet sent Ali to Yeman and gave him the following direction: "You are not to take decision unless you have heard the second party in the same way as you have heard the first".

(14) The Right to decision in accordance with proper judicial procedure.

"O ye who believe! If an evil-liver bring you news, verify it, lest you smite some folk in ignorance and afterward repent of what ye did." (49; verse 6).

"O man, follow not that whereof thou hast no knowledge". (17; verse 36).

"Lo! Allah commandeth you that ye restore deposits to their owners, and, if ye judge between mankind, that ye judge justly." (4; verse 58).

CHAPTER 6

REALISATION OF THE IDEAL OF 'SOLIDARITY'

Pakistan came into being primarily because the Muslims of the Indian sub-continent regarded themselves as a distinct nation. Since the establishment of Pakistan, however, the geographical non-contiguity of the country, on the one hand, and the existence of Provincialism, Sectarianism and Tribalism, on the other, have set barriers to the growth and evolution of a single nationhood. Quaid-i-Azam was aware that the people of the two wings of Pakistan did not descend from the same racial stock. They spoke different languages, and possessed different historical and cultural backgrounds. He was conscious that they could be welded into a unified whole only through the spiritual bond i.e., the adherence to the faith of Islam which they shared in common.

In one of his addresses to the Muslims, Quaid-i-Azam rightly pointed out: "As long as you do not throw off this poison (provincialism) in our body politic, you will never be able to weld yourself into a real true nation....Islam has taught us this, and I think you will agree with that whatever else you may be and whatever you are, you are a Muslim. You belong to a nation now; you have now carved out a territory, a vast territory, it is all yours; it does not belong to a Punjabi or a Sindhi or a Pathan or a Bengali, it is yours."[1]

Anyway, the important question is: For how long is the ideal of a spiritual unity going to endure when it has to face the obstinate material forces let loose by the geographical non-contiguity of the country and the rising economic discontent every where; and when steps are yet to be taken in the field of education through the adoption of a uniform system of instruction and the changing of the old syllabus to weld, mould and galvanise the people of Pakistan into a real true nation?

A penetraitng glance at the conditions prevalent in Pakistan reveals that actually the growth of Provincialism is being stimulated by economic forces, though racial and cultural factors may also be involved. The province of East Pakistan, for instance, contains more than half the population of Pakistan, and its inhabitants are more homogeneous than the inhabitants of the provinces of West Pakistan. (It is a single unit, its inhabitants descend from the same racial stock and speak the same language). West Pakistan, however, originally contained four units (the Punjab, North West Frontier Province, Sind, and Baluchistan) but under the Establishment of West Pakistan Act, 1955, the provinces and states were integrated into one unit called the province of West Pakistan.

Although the establishment of West Pakistan as a single unit was motivated by economic considerations for the benefit of all the integrating provinces and states, it also amounted to taking a practical measure for the realisation of the ideal of *solidarity* among the inhabitants, at least of West Pakistan, who are unfortunately, not as homogeneous as the inhabitants of East Pakistan. (The inhabitants of West Pakistan descend from different racial stock and speak different languages).

At any rate, there was nothing novel in the amalgamation of the provinces and states of West Pakistan into a single unit for it was an old project recommended by numerous viceroys and administrators of the former British India. The Punjab and the North West Frontier Province in fact formed a single province until 1901; and if the occupation of Sind by the British (in 1843) had followed and not preceded the occupation of the Punjab (in 1849), Sind would have certainly been incorporated in the Punjab instead of Bombay Presidency, because the two provinces (the Punjab and Sind) were contiguous and connected by the natural tie of a single river and its tributaries.

Iqbal was probably aware of this old project, for when he first expressed the desire (in 1930) for creating a Muslim State in the Indian subcontinent, he used the following words: "I would like to see the Punjab, North West Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan *amalgamated into a single state.* Self-government within the British Empire, or without the British Empire, the formation of a *consoli-*

dated North West Indian Muslim state appears to me to be the final destiny of the Muslims at least of North West India."[2]

Thus to realise the ideal of *solidarity* among the people, which is, as has already been pointed out, one of the important ingredients of *Tauhid* (Unity of God), it would have been better to continue to retain West Pakistan as a single unit, and at the same time to establish closer relationship between East and West Pakistan through the development of trade, commerce, industry and agriculture. (But the Province of West Pakistan has now again been broken up into its original four units.) In order to weld the people into a unified whole, it is extremely essential to solve the economic problem of Pakistan, for unity and solidarity cannot be achieved in actuality unless and until there is prosperity in the country. In this connection the acceptance of social democracy in some suitable form (i.e. consistent with the legal principles of Islam) would lead to the solution of very many of our problems. The acceptance of such social democracy, in the opinion of Iqbal, would not be "a revolution but a return to the original purity of Islam."[3]

Although Islam is a binding force, there are plenty of other factors to drive the people of Pakistan apart from one another. The geographical non-contiguity of Pakistan is itself an obstinate barrier which has been imposed upon the people by the unusual layout of the country, and which cannot be surmounted unless the two halves of Pakistan can find a sustained common interest in supporting a central head. However, it is only together that East and West Pakistan can form a bigger and more viable economic unit and a more effective international force than either can be alone. It is, therefore, necessary for the State to adopt a suitable economic policy supported by some suitable form of social democracy to bind the people of Pakistan together. The greatest danger to the realisation of the ideal of *solidarity* among the people of Pakistan would be as Iqbal has already warned us, the development of an acquisitive economy based on the model of modern Western Capitalism.[4]

Another solution of the problem ought to be found through the means of modern education which is indeed absolutely vital for the industrial and economic development of the country. Modern

education should also be utilised for realising the ideal of *solidarity* among the people of Pakistan.

Syed Ahmad Khan was the first Muslim in the Indian sub-continent to catch a glimpse of the positive character of the age which was to follow him. He felt the need of a fresh orientation of Islam and worked for it through the dissemination of, what may be termed, modern education among the Muslims. His sensitive soul realised perfectly that although the Muslims retained the discipline of Islam, the will which that discipline was intended to fortify had been completely destroyed. His attempt to interpret the religion of Islam scientifically was misunderstood mainly because the extreme Conservatism of the Muslims of the Indian sub-continent had made them lose their hold on the realities of life and consequently they failed to grasp the real meaning of the religious attitude of Syed Ahmad Khan.

Iqbal, like Syed Ahmad Khan, was fully aware of the short-comings of the Muslims. In the matter of reconstructing the Muslim society, his attitude, however, was bolder than that of Syed Ahmad Khan. "During the last five hundred years", he observed, "religious thought in Islam has been practically stationary. There was a time when European thought received inspiration from the world of Islam. The most remarkable phenomenon of modern history, however, is the enormous rapidity with which the world of Islam is spiritually moving towards the West. There is nothing wrong in this movement for European culture, on its intellectual side, is only a further development of some of the most important phases of the culture of Islam. Our only fear is that the dazzling exterior of European culture may arrest our movement and we may fail to reach the true inwardness of that culture. During all the centuries of our intellectual stupor Europe has been seriously thinking on the great problems in which the philosophers and scientists of Islam were so keenly interested. Since the Middle Ages, when the schools of Muslim theology were completed, infinite advance has taken place in the domain of human thought and experience. The extension of man's power over nature has given him a new faith and a fresh sense of superiority over the forces that constitute his environment. New points of view have been suggested, old problems have been restated in the light of fresh experience, and new problems have arisen....No wonder that the younger generation of Islam in Asia

and Africa demand a fresh orientation of their faith. With the re-awakening of Islam, therefore, it is necessary to examine, in an independent spirit, what Europe has thought and how far the conclusions reached by her can help us in the revision and, if necessary, reconstruction of theological thought in Islam. Besides this, it is not possible to ignore the generally anti-religious and especially anti-Islamic propaganda in Central Asia which has already crossed the Indian frontier....Surely, it is high time to look to the essentials of Islam....The Quran opens our eyes to the great fact of change, through the appreciation and control of which alone it is possible to build up a durable civilisation. The cultures of Asia and, in fact, of the whole ancient world, failed, because they approached Reality exclusively from within and moved from within outwards. This procedure gave them theory without power, and on mere theory no durable civilisation can be based....The task before the modern Muslim is, therefore, immense. He has to rethink the whole system of Islam without completely breaking with the past....The only course open to us is to approach modern knowledge with a respectful but independent attitude and to appreciate the teachings of Islam in the light of that knowledge, even though we may be led to differ from those who have gone before us."[5]

The *Liberalism* of Syed Ahmad Khan and Iqbal resulted from the realisation that modernity was an existential fact just as the teaching of Islam that the realities of life are to be faced and not avoided was a fact. It is mainly for this reason that Iqbal felt the necessity of reviving *Ijtihad* which he regarded as the principle of movement in the structure of Islam, and equipped us with the philosophy of what he called: *Permanence-in-change.*

Iqbal longed for the emergence of new *Ulema* from among the modern Muslims who should approach Modernism with an attitude of moderation instead of hostility, and who, with a full knowledge of their own tradition at their disposal, should be able to look forward to the future. "Spiritually we are living in a prison-house of thoughts and emotions which during the course of centuries we have weaved around ourselves....Islam requires emancipation from the mediaeval fancies of theologians and legists," he proclaimed.[6]

In order to emancipate Islam from Mediaevalism, it is necessary to rear self-concentrated individuals rather than to emphasise on over-organisation founded on the blind following (*Taqlid*) of the past authorities. Iqbal made it perfectly clear that "the ultimate fate of a people does not depend so much on organisation as on the worth and power of individual men. In an over-organised society the individual is altogether crushed out of existence. He gains the whole wealth of social thought around him and loses his own soul. Thus a false reverence for past history and its artificial resurrection constitute no remedy for a people's decay. 'The verdict of history' as a modern writer has happily put it, 'is that worn out ideas have never risen to power among a people who have worn them out.' The only effective power, therefore, that counteracts the forces of decay in a people is the rearing of self-concentrated individuals. Such indivlduals alone reveal the depth of life. They disclose new standards in the light of which we begin to see that our environment is not wholly inviolable and requires a revision. The tendency to over-organisation by a false reverence of the past as manifested in the legists of Islam in the thirteenth century and later, was contrary to the inner impulse of Islam."[7]

It is rather unfortunate that the *Liberalism* and *moderation* of Syed Ahmad Khan and Iqbal have not yet been disseminated among us. Emotionally we are divided into two groups. A large majority among us, owing to the prevalent illiteracy, stupidity and credulousness hold very conservative views, and are not prepared to accept change in any form. On the other hand, the secular nature of our education has evolved a completely nihilist group among us, who are not only disconnected from our past but who also regard our religion, our culture and our historical traditions as absolutely worthless..

It has been noted that Pakistan was established in order that the Muslims of the Indian sub-continent could develop themselves on the lines of their own distinctive culture. The Objectives Resolution, 1949, embodied this aspiration of the Muslims when it declared that the Muslims of Pakistan would be enabled individually and collectively to order their lives in accordance with the teachings and requirements of Islam as set forth in the Quran and Sunnah. The questions may be asked: During the past years has our political leadership taken any steps to bring up the rising generation of the Muslims of

Pakistan according to the principle stated above? Did they feel the necessity of reforming our educational institutions in the light of the principle stated above? Or did they ever think in terms of changing the method of instruction or replacing the old syllabus by a new one which could meet the requirements of Islam?

The study of history reveals that when by the force or the power of a new ideal a new nation is born, it is always a group of idealists or dreamers with a practical vision and an exemplary character who rear and mould such a nation in the early stages of its development. These personalities endeavour, at the very early stages of a nation's development, to give a practical shape to the ideals and aspirations which led to the founding of the nation. Such founders of nations usually believe that the development of the nation will guarantee that its Ideology will be kept eternally alive in the minds of the people. And indeed the Ideology of no nation can survive eternally unless and until practical measures are adopted to rear up the younger generation in accordance with the requirements of the foundational Ideology of the nation.

Up to the time of the establishment of Pakistan, we did produce personalities who had the complete confidence of the people. But afterwards, however, particularly since the death of Quaid-i-Azam, although we have produced political leadership of a mediocre calibre, we failed to produce political leaders of the calibre of Quaid-i-Azam, or idealists and dreamers of the calibre of Iqbal. Consequently no means were adopted to inculcate the Ideology of Pakistan in the present and future generations. The need of reforming our educational institutions was not felt, and, similarly, nobody cared to think in terms of changing the present method of instruction or replacing the old syllabus by a new one which could meet the requirements of Islam.

For realising the ideal of *solidarity*, it is extremely essential to disseminate among the people the foundational principles which lie behind the idea of Pakistan and to acquaint the present and the future generations with these principles in order that the Ideology may be preserved. It is, therefore, necessary to reform our educational institutions, to change the present method of instruction and to replace the old syllabus by a new one. At the same time, steps

should be taken to implement a scheme of mass education with special and particular emphasis on the Ideology of Pakistan.

The object of education should not only be to make good citizens out of the people, or to equip them with the necessary technical, mechanical or other qualifications with which they could secure jobs or utilise their knowledge, skill and ability for the benefit of the community as a whole, but also to produce leaders possessing 'a keen perception of the spirit and destiny of Islam, along with an equally keen perception of the trend of modern history.'

The Muslims of the Indian sub-continent have been rather unfortunate, particularly because of the lack of great leaders. It is rarely that they produce outstanding personalities which could be the driving force behind the people. The confused and chaotic political scene in Pakistan that followed the death of Quaid-i-Azam and that has prevailed ever since was very similar to the one about which Iqbal made the following remarks in 1932 :

"And be it further said to the shame of us men of the older generation, that we have failed to equip the younger generation for the economic, political and even religious crises that the present age is likely to bring. The whole community needs a complete overhauling of its present mentality in order that it may again become capable of feeling the urge of fresh desires and ideals. The Muslim has long ceased to explore the depths of his inner self. . . . There is yet a sort of chaos in the political thought of those who are supposed to guide the activities of the Muslims in the present day political struggles."[8]

Iqbal believes that great leaders are God's gift and cannot be made to order. But this view is not altogether correct. If the Community is provided with the facilities of a proper education, it can still produce personalities with an insight into the shape of things to come. The educational institutions like Eton and Harrow, whatever their worth from a socialistic standpoint, were certainly capable of producing outstanding political leaders in nineteenth century England.

What steps, then, should be taken in the field of education so that the people of Pakistan may be welded into a unified whole whilst retaining their regional pride, culture, and traditions?

It would not be wrong to say that the creation of Pakistan has raised entirely new problems which have no precedent in the history of the political thought of the Muslims of the Indian sub-continent. The decision, for instance, to adopt two State languages (Urdu and Bengali) was the solution of one of the problems which had arisen mainly from the geographical non-contiguity of Pakistan. The position at present is this: So far as the acquisition of modern sciences and the relations of Pakistan with other nations of the world are concerned, English cannot be discarded for a very long time to come. It was, therefore, a wise move to retain English as the State language of Pakistan for the time being. But if English is to be retained and if Urdu and Bengali both are also to become the State languages of Pakistan, then, so long as a single script is not adopted, at least for the writing of Urdu and Bengali, the people of Pakistan would be obliged to learn not only three languages but also to master three completely different scripts.

It could be suggested that in order to secure uniformity in the instruction of these languages, Pakistan should adopt the Latin script as the State script. Apparently there is nothing wrong with this suggestion. When the Latin script was adopted as the State script in Turkey, Iqbal did not hesitate to point out that as a society Islam does not require any specific language, script or dress. But whatever the merits or demerits of the adoption of the Latin script, the important point is that usually languages and the script in which they are written constitute an integral part of the Ideology of a people, and it is not easy to decide such issues merely by the force of logic or for the sake of convenience or expediency. The emotions of the people are attached to their Ideology and everything that pertains to it. One of the aspects of the Turkish Ideology is that it was founded on grievances against the Arabism of that time which had been hostile to the Turks. It was, therefore, easier for the Turks to discard the Arabic script and to adopt another script of their own choice.

If Urdu, for instance, were written in Hindi characters, then there would have been no difficulty in discarding those characters in

Pakistan and adopting another script of our liking (mainly because our ideology was based on distinguishing ourselves from Hinduism which had been hostile to us).

Every student of Muslim politics is aware of the fact that on the suppression of Arabic and Persian as the court languages of the Indian sub-continent, the Muslims adopted Urdu (written in Urdu script which is similar to Persian or Arabic script) as their vernacular, and insisted on its retention when the Hindus demanded that Urdu should be replaced by Hindi. Syed Ahmad Khan while emphasising the need for a separate method of instruction which should preserve the languages of Muslim culture (Arabic and Persian) championed the cause of Urdu which had come to be regarded as the language of Muslim culture.

Maulana Muhammad Ali and the other *Khilafat* leaders also upheld the cause of Urdu and Urdu script. In fact it would not be wrong to say that the desire of the Muslims to retain Urdu along with its script as their vernacular was an integral part of the Muslim separatist movement, mainly because it supported their claim to be culturally distinct from the other and the larger cultural unit; consequently Muslim India supported the cause of Urdu and its script at every stage of her political development.

On the creation of Pakistan as the home and the State of the *Muslim nation*, it was believed that Urdu written in Urdu script would be given the status of the State language. Quaid-i-Azam proclaimed in 1948: "Let me make it clear to you that the State language of Pakistan is going to be Urdu and no other language.... Without one State language, no nation can remain tied up solidly together and function."[9]

The position has, however, changed considerably since Quaid-i-Azam made this famous speech, because the champions of Bengali insisted on Bengali being given the status of a State language side by side with Urdu. The claim of the champions of Bengali rested on the grounds that they constituted more than half the population of Pakistan and that, therefore, there should be two State languages.

Anyway, the duality of State languages of Pakistan should be overcome by the adoption of a common script. The regional languages of West Pakistan (e.g., Punjabi, Pashtu, Sindhi Baluchi,) are written in the same characters in which Urdu is written. Even Bengali was written in the Persian characters at one time. It would, therefore, be advisable to adopt the Persian or Arabic script as the State script provided that the champions of Bengali give their consent to this arrangement. If Bengali and Urdu both were eventually to attain the status of the State languages, the adoption of Persian or Arabic script would go a long way towards unifying the people of the two wings of Pakistan.

It cannot be denied that Arabic and Persian languages have always been regarded as the languages of Islamic culture in the Indian sub-continent. Besides this, if there is any future for any script other than the European scripts (e.g., Latin or Gothic script) it is Arabic or Persian script. The use of Arabic or Persian characters in writing Bengali and Urdu would also affirm the fact that the Muslims of Pakistan constitute a single nation, and thus it would be perfectly in accordance with the Ideology of Pakistan. Not many people would oppose the adoption of the Persian or Arabic script by the State for the purpose of writing Bengali and Urdu, but the adoption of any script other than Arabic or Persian (e.g., Latin script) would lead to resentment and opposition throughout Pakistan (East as well as West)

The next important question that should attract our attention is the matter of making provision for instructing or teaching the Bengali and Urdu languages in the schools of Pakistan as soon as possible.

The syllabus for the primary and the matriculation standards should be selected and framed with great care In order that the Ideology of Pakistan may be preserved among our present and future generations, a study of *history*, *literature* and *theology* is very essential.

Study of History

God, through the Quran, in the opinion of Iqbal, makes constant appeal to the reason and experience of man and lays emphasis on *Nature* and *History* as sources of human knowledge. It is, in fact,

through the study of *Nature* (empirical, technical and mechanical sciences) and *History* that the spirit of Islam actually reveals itself.

From the ideological standpoint, therefore, it is essential that there should be an emphasis on the study of *History* in our schools. Most of the histories of the Muslim rule in India have been written or compiled by non-Muslim authors (either Hindu or British) with a spirit of hostility rather than sympathy towards Islam. Such histories consequently misrepresent facts and are distorted. It is, therefore, necessary to rewrite the histories particularly of the Muslim rule in India, so that our children may have a clearer and truer picture of our past.

The histories should be written with due regard to the following:

(a) They must reveal to our younger generations the fundamental principles of *movement* and *change* in the life of the Muslim peoples. The Holy Prophet is reported to have said: "Do not denounce Time for Time is God." This implies that it is the passage of time which determines the worth of the Ideologies on which nations are founded. If the Ideology of a nation cannot withstand the test of time, it has to undergo a *change*, otherwise the nation which is founded on that Ideology is bound to perish.

(b) The histories should emphasise the struggles of the Muslim peoples, and should not merely record the achievements of *Sultans* and *Padshahs*.

(c) The histories should indicate that from the establishment of the Muslim rule in the Indian sub-continent (in 711) to the accession of the Mughal Emperor Babur (in 1526), Muslim India remained constitutionally linked with the rest of the Muslim world through the acknowledgement of the Central Caliphate (first established at Medinah, then at Damascus, then at Baghdad and finally at Cairo). Soon after the power of the Mughals declined and India fell into the hands of the British, the question: How were the Muslims of the Indian sub-continent or those living outside the Ottoman Empire related to the Ottoman Caliphate? occupied the minds of the Muslim jurists.

(d) The histories must enumerate the causes and reasons for the ideological isolation of the Muslims as a Community from the Hindus (e.g., those mentioned by Al-Beruni in his famous *Kitabul Hind* written in the ninth century), and the numerous fruitless attempts which were made during the course of centuries to unify the two Communities.

In short, the histories must clearly show that the roots of our present Ideology, that is to say, our distinction from the Hindus, our desire to develop ourselves along the lines of our own distinctive culture, and our aspiration to bring about a unification of the Muslim world, actually lie in our past.

Study of Literature

The selection of pieces of *Literature* for the primary and matriculation standards should be based on the study of the writings of the authors associated with the *Aligarh movement.* In the nineteenth century, for the first time in the history of Indian Islam, the poets and writers used their talents for the welfare of the Muslim Community, and laid the foundations of what may be called 'literature for the service of the Community'. It was in fact the ideal formulated by the authors associated with the *Aligarh movement* that found its fullest realisation in the work of Iqbal. The authors connected with the *Aligarh movement plus Iqbal*, therefore, provide the cultural background of the Ideology of Pakistan. Pieces of Bengali literature should also be selected with the above object in view.

Study of Theology

The study of *Theology* should be made compulsory for the Muslim children in all the State-run schools, in order that the Muslim children may be enabled to at least go through a selected portion of the Quran and become familiar with the foundational principles of Islam.

A question may be raised here: How would it be possible to introduce the subject of *Theology* (or give instruction in the Quran) in the State-run schools of Pakistan when there exist sectarian differences among the Muslims?

First of all, as far as the sectarian differences among the Muslims are concerned, one basic point must be understood and grasped. It is that all the sects among the Muslims agree on the foundational principles of Islam. In other words, there is no disagreement among the Muslim sects with regard to the primary essentials of Islam. All the Muslim sects agree upon the structural principles of the Unity of God and the Finality of Muhammad's Prophethood, supplemented by the five well-defined *Obligations of the Faith.* Thus, if there exist differences among the Muslim sects they are merely of interpretation of the law of Islam or of the details of practice.

In the United States, most of the State-run educational institutions are secular purely because the Protestants and the Catholics do not agree on the primary essentials of Christianity. The Protestants (including their sects) and the Catholics may be called Christians in a very general, broad, vague and undefined sense of the term, but among themselves they seem to regard one another as belonging to completely different religious denominations. Protestants appear to think that to be a Catholic does not imply belonging to a different sect of Christianity, but belonging to a different religion—just as a Jew or a Muslim belongs to a different religion.

The case of the Muslim sects, as has already been explained, is altogether different. Their differences are based either on varieties of the interpretation of the law of Islam or minor differences in the details of practice. These differences are in fact healthy for they provide a vast range in the interpretations of the Law of God to an inquisitive Muslim. A Muslim is free to follow any School of Law or accept the opinions of any sect and still remain fundamentally a Muslim. The Holy Prophet has approved of such sectarian differences among the Muslims for he is reported to have said: "Difference of opinion in my Community is (the manifestation of Divine) Mercy".

The second important point that deserves consideration in this connection is that two Muslim sects predominate in Pakistan—the *Sunnis,* following the *Hanafi* School of Law; and the *Shias* (*Ithna Asharia* sect) following the *Imamia* Code of Law. The other Muslim sects constitute only small minorities. They have their own educational institutions which provide facilities for religious instruction of

their own persuasion (just as Christian Missionary Schools provide facilities for religious instruction according to their own persuasion).

If the subject of *Theology* is introduced or instruction in the Quran is given in the State-run schools of Pakistan, it would only mean the selection of a course of theology which is approved by both the *Sunnis* and the *Shias*, and this should not be a difficult matter. The Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental College founded by Syed Ahmad Khan at Aligarh successfully managed to provide religious instruction to the *Sunnis* as well as the *Shias*. This arrangement encouraged the growth of tolerance and fellow-feeling among the students. Indeed non-Muslim students were admitted to the College, though they were exempt from theological instruction. Cow-slaughter was forbidden and beef was not served to the College.

"The study of the Quran", observes Dr. Ghulam Jilani "at early stages of a child's life, though it does not give him knowledge of Islam, does definitely create in him an attitude of reverence for religion which persists throughout later life. In some cases it serves as a strong motive force for acts of bravery and sacrifice in defence of Islam. It is probably such people, whom we some time do not regard as good Muslims, as have come forward in crucial situations in the history of Islam, to save the Muslims and Islam from complete extinction."[10]

It would, therefore, be wise to provide facilities for religious instruction in the State-run schools in order that the Ideology of Pakistan may be preserved among the younger generations while they are still at an impressionable age. Religious instruction at an early age would certainly equip and enable our youth to cope with the numerous exterior Ideologies which are opposed to our Ideology.

From the ideological standpoint, it is also necessary that highly qualified teachers should be provided particularly up to the primary standard. It is only in the primary standard that the personality and character of a child can really be moulded and shaped. The prevalent dishonesty, cheating and lack of moral scruples in our youth have actually resulted from bad instruction and example at the primary stage, although unhappy homes may also be partly responsible for it.

At present the instruction of religion, wherever it is provided in our educational institutions, is in the hands of low-paid and unqualified persons (like the *Imams* in our mosques). They present Islam in such a way that our youth either ridicule it or make a laughing stock of it. The religion of Islam, therefore, could only be respected and be effective if the status of the instructors in religion is raised in the eyes of our children, and this is possible only if the dignity, rank and social status of the teachers of *Theology* (the poor *Maulvi Sahib*) is the equivalent of the other teachers or professors of our Universities.

The standard of teaching particularly of the Urdu, Bengali and English languages should be made uniform in all our educational institutions. At present some educational institutions in the country pay more attention to the teaching of English language whereas they neglect Urdu and Bengali. Other institutions, however, which lay more emphasis on the teaching of Urdu or Bengali, neglect English. The result is that our youth when admitted to the Universities are either proficient in English without having much knowledge of Urdu or Bengali, or are proficient in Urdu or Bengali, without having any idea of English. This handicaps our students at the university level, and it also leads to a division in our society between the English and the Urdu or Bengali educated groups.

In order to inculcate the Ideology of Pakistan in the present and future generations, and to weld the people of Pakistan into a unified whole whilst retaining intact their regional pride, culture and traditions, it is necessary to establish the following additional faculties in our Universities.

The Faculties of Bengali and Urdu

The Universities of Pakistan should provide facilities for the study of Bengali and Urdu languages and literature up to the Master's Degree. Research in the State languages and their literature should be encouraged, under the supervision of able, skilled and experienced scholars in these languages. The degree of Ph.D. in the above languages, should be awarded to the outstanding research scholars. The work of translating Bengali literature into Urdu and *vice versa* should also be taken up by the above faculties.

The Faculty of Regional Languages

In order to preserve the regional languages, culture and traditions of Pakistan, the Universities of Pakistan should provide facilities for the study of Pashtu, Sindhi, Punjabi, Kashmiri and Baluchi languages up to the Master's Degree. Research in the regional languages, literature, folklore, culture and traditions should be encouraged under the supervision of able, skilled and experienced scholars in these languages. The Degree of Ph.D. in the above languages, should be awarded to the outstanding research scholars. The work of translating the literature of the regional languages into Bengali and Urdu should be undertaken by the above faculty.

This faculty should also provide facilities to the specialists in the regional languages to carry on archaeological, anthropological, ethnological, architectural and historical researches on the different regions of Pakistan.

The Faculty of Islamic Languages

The facilities are already provided for the study of Arabic and Persian—the languages of Islamic culture. But it would be in accordance with the Ideology of Pakistan to provide, through our Universities, facilities for the study of the Turkish and Indonesian languages. Very little is known about Indonesia in Pakistan, although her Muslim population is almost equal in number to that of Pakistan. There is a likelihood, as W. C. Smith remarks, that the modern renaissance in Islam may shift the centre of gravity of the Muslim world from the shores of the Mediterranean to those of the Indian Ocean.[11] It is, therefore, necessary that we should take a keen interest in the establishment, growth, development and progress of Islam in South East Asia.

The Faculty of Theology

In order to preserve the Ideology of Pakistan and to weld the people into a unified whole it is most essential to introduce the Faculty of Theology in all the Universities of Pakistan. The students in the F.A. and B.A. classes who have taken up Arabic as a subject should be permitted to take up Islamic Theology. A person should only

qualify as a graduate in Islamic Theology, if he has studied the whole of the Quran, *Tradition*, History of the Muslim sects and the Schools of Law, has a full knowledge of the ritual and practice of Islam, a study of comparative religions (particularly those which prevail in Pakistan), a study of the sociology and psychology of religion, a critical study of the ancient and modern history of the Muslim world (with special reference to the history of the Muslims in the Indian sub-continent), and some idea of modern philosophy and economics. The standard of the Master's Degree in Theology, therefore, should be high enough to include all the above mentioned subjects, so that the specialists in this subject may be enabled to carry on advanced studies in Islamic theology, jurisprudence, philosophy, ethics, economics, politics, history, literature etc.

Only the graduates in Islamic Theology should be eligible for the appointment of the *Imams* for all the mosques of Pakistan, and should also be eligible as teachers in the schools and Universities of Pakistan.

The Faculty of Comparative Religions

The Universities of Pakistan should provide facilities for the study of Comparative Religions (including those Faiths which prevail in Pakistan) up to the Master's Degree. Research facilities should also be provided in the above subject. Since the study of Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Sanskrit and perhaps other languages is required for advanced studies in the above subject, facilities should be provided for the study of these languages in due course.

The study of this subject would not only broaden the outlook of the Muslims, but would enable them to understand better the meaning of their own religion in terms of the religious history of the rest of the world, and would also encourage a spirit of tolerance, love and understanding among the people professing different Faiths in Pakistan. Besides this, it is an integral part of our Ideology to preserve, protect and defend the Faiths of those citizens of Pakistan who profess religions other than Islam.

The Establishment of Islamic Research Centres

Last of all, in order to realise the ideal of *solidarity* among the people and to preserve the Ideology of Pakistan, it is necessary that the State should establish two Islamic Research Centres preferably at Lahore and Dacca, the oldest seats of learning in Pakistan.

It has already been noted that under Article 197 of the 1956 Constitution and Article 207 of the 1962 Constitution, the President was obliged to set up an organisation for Islamic research and instruction in advanced studies to assist in the reconstruction of Muslim society on a truly Islamic basis. But nothing substantial was achieveved in this connection. If at all such organisations for Islamic research were established, the only persons who benefited much from them were a group of intellectuals who were more skilled in the art of flattering the rulers than in genuine scholarship.

Since these so-called organisations for Islamic research were not affiliated to our Universities, our students could not get a chance to avail themselves of their facilities in order to develop their capacity for creative and constructive research. Consequently the object of reconstructing the Muslim society on a truly Islamic basis through these organisations was never achieved.

In each and every country of the world where there exists a genuine desire for advanced studies and a genuine thirst for knowledge, research centres and organisations always appear to be affiliated to the Universities (or seats of learning). If they do exist independently or outside of the Universities, then usually the object behind them is *political* rather than scholarly.

Thus for the purpose of reconstructing Muslim society in this country on a truly Islamic basis, it is very essential that all the existing so-called Islamic research organisations and Iqbal Academies should be amalgamated into Islamic Research Centres and affiliated to the Universities at Dacca and Lahore. These centres should contain as integral parts huge libraries which should include all the books on Islam, old as well as new, written in each and every language of the world. The current weekly, monthly or other periodicals on

Islam which are printed and published in the Muslim as well as non-Muslim countries of the world, should be available at these libraries.

In order to guide and supervise the work of our research scholars, a few enlightened, liberal-minded and experienced professors should be imported. Such professors should not only specialise in classical Islamic theology, jurisprudence and history of Islamic culture, but they should also possess a keen insight into the trends of modern history and the requirements of modern times. The Centres should provide facilities to our research scholars to continue their advanced studies, in their respective fields, abroad e.g., at the Universities of Afghanistan, Iran, Turkey, Egypt, Indonesia, India, Germany, France, England, Canada, United States, and if possible also China and the southern Muslim republics of the Soviet Union.

It is only through the establishment of these Centres on the lines suggested above that it would be possible to reconstruct Muslim thought, to rejuvenate Islamic culture and to build up and unify Muslim society in this country on a truly Islamic basis. Islam lies mid-way between Europe and South East Asia and since it is a synthesis of the Eastern and Western outlooks on life, there is no reason why it should not act as a kind of intermediary between the East and the West.

CHAPTER 7

THE IDEAL CITIZEN

Legally speaking, the Pakistan Citizenship Act, 1951, enumerates the circumstances and conditions under which a person could be regarded as a citizen of Pakistan. The ideal citizen of Pakistan, however, is the *Momin* i.e., any person who truly, sincerely, honestly and steadfastly believes in the God of Islam and everything which He enjoins.

In order to grasp the qualities or attributes which constitute a *Momin*, it is first of all necessary to approach and evaluate Islamic history critically.

Every student of the history of Islam is aware of the fact that the warring tribes of the Arabian peninsula were unified into one people by the Arabian Prophet under the Ideology of Islam, and united Islam set out from Arabia to conquer its adversary 'Paganism'. The greater part of what now constitutes the Muslim world fell into the hands of the Muslims shortly after the death of the Holy Prophet.

The rapid annexation of vast territories into *Darul Islam* (the abode of Peace) brought prosperity, and prosperity reawakened the Arab tribal lust for the political leadership of Islam. Within a decade or so after the death of the Holy Prophet, Islam had not only been divided into three religio-political divisions (the *Shias*, the *Khwaraj* and the *Sunnis*) but stood on the verge of civil war. The republic was replaced by a hereditary monarchy, and the centuries that followed witnessed the development of a kind of despotism which had no sanction in Islam.

The individual lost all significance and the Community came to be identified with this or that sect. Meanwhile the length of the sword decided the issue of the ownership of this or that portion of the Muslim world, and consequently empires rose and fell on Islam's

own blood. Century after century history repeated itself, and there was no end to the hunger for the acquisition of territory, until Islam became thoroughly and completely exhausted. It became devoid of all vitality, and ceased to be an active religio-political force.

Allah, the original God of Islam, as revealed in the Quran, was an alive, vigorous, virile, violent and righteous personality. He was the God of the brave, proud, just, yet simple and straight forward people. *Allah*, therefore, was the God of a strong race whose strength reflected the strength of their God.

The question: What is a *Momin*? never arose in the early phase of Islamic history because any and every person who believed in the Unity of God and the Finality of Muhammad's Prophethood, who felt that the Quran was revealed to him just as it was revealed to the Holy Prophet, who fortified his will by imposing upon himself the discipline of Islam, and who realised in actuality the ideals of *equality*, *solidarity* and *freedom* by doing that which was permitted under the Law of God—was a *Momin*. He had surrendered himself completely and entirely to the God of Islam and, therefore, his will was the Will and his hand was the Hand of the God of Islam. He believed in himself and his God and, therefore, he conquered and was successful.

Within a couple of centuries after the advent of Islam when decadence had resulted from the tribal and racial jealousies of numerous people who came within the fold of Islam, and when Greek and Persian thought had started exerting its influence on the minds of the Muslim theologians and mystics, all the conditions of exalted life were withdrawn from the idea of the personality of the God of Islam, and everything strong, brave, domineering, proud and dynamic was taken away. The living and creative God of Islam was transformed into a static pantheistic God and was made to hold an absolute position in a fixed universe. He was reduced merely to an *Ideal*, an *Abstraction*, or was called a *Substance*, a *Pure Spirit*, a *Divine Principle*. He was God no more but had been changed into a dead and lifeless thing.

The Muslim mystics of the later phases of Islamic history, contrary to the original teachings of Islam, renounced the world of

matter as profane and devoted themselves entirely to spiritualism. The Muslim theologians of this period, on the other hand, slavishly surrendering their ego to the dictates of the past authorities, closed the *Gates of Ijtihad* (independent inquiry) and thus made the entire religious thought in Islam practically stationary. As a result, although the discipline of Islam was formally retained by some, the will which that discipline was intended to fortify had been completely destroyed. The true *Momin* made an exit from the scene leaving behind the abstract and unrealisable, exclusively moral and spiritual ideal of the *Perfect Man* (*Insan-i-Kamil*) of the later mystics of Islam. This mystic ideal destroyed the original concept of *Momin* as a person concerned to act in the world.

The God of Islam and *Momin* are interdependent and complementary forces. If the idea of God is reduced to merely an Omnipotent Will which inculcates fatalism and encourages renunciation, then naturally the *Momin*—the strong, courageous and powerful man who loved purity, privation, freedom, adventure, hardship and toughness and who lived dangerously would cease to be the ideal of humanity. Thus the God of Islam as represented by the *spineless* mysticism of the later phases of Islamic history and by the *slaves* of the dictates of past authorities (*Muqqallidun*) was a product of and had been manufactured by a decayed people whose character was reflected in the God of their creation.

"What would be the use" says Nietzsche, "of a God to whom anger, revenge, envy, sarcasm, cunning, violence were unknown?..... One would not understand such a deity; why should one have him? But when a race decays, when it feels its belief in the future, its hope of liberty finally vanishing; when submission appears to it as the most useful policy, and the virtues of the slave present themselves to the conscience of its members as a condition of existence, then must also the idea of God change. The God becomes nervous, fearful, humble, recommends the 'peace of mind', preaches against hatred, recommends cautiousness and 'love' both of friend and foe; he is perpetually moralising, he becomes everybody's God, becomes a private gentleman, becomes a cosmopolitan."[1]

In the opinion of the early mystics (when mysticism was a real force of spiritual education), theologians, and legists of Islam,

Momin represented an evolutionary stage of Man's progress from 'paganism' to 'belief' in the Unity of God (*Muslim*) and from 'belief' to 'true and sincere belief' (*Momin*). In other words, the *Momin* emerges from the *Muslim* as the *Muslim* grows in the intenstiy of his truthfulness, sincerity, honesty and steadfastness of 'belief' in and love for the God of Islam.

In the Quran, the use of the terms *Muslim* and *Momin* also denotes a variation in the degree of intensity in the love of God. For instance, God says in the Quran: "Successful indeed are the believers (*Mu'minun*) who are humble in their prayers, and who shun vain conversation, and who are payers of the poor-tax (*Zakat*) and who guard their modesty....and who are shepherds of their pledge and their covenant, and who pay heed to their prayers. They are the heirs who will inherit Paradise."

The *Momin*, in the eyes of God, is (a) righteous, sincere, and God-fearing; (b) he is modest, pure, and a man of manners; (c) he is straightforward; (d) just; (e) steadfast; (f) affectionate towards his parents, children and orphans; (g) he abhors slander and (h) back-biting; (i) he is courteous and even careful of small kindnesses; (j) he helps God, and (k) belongs to God's party; (l) he does not simply 'believe' but genuinely and sincerely 'submits' to God and His Prophet; (m) he is God's soldier and fights only for God's sake. These are some of the attributes of the *Momin* as the following verses of the Quran (also supported by the Sunnah) would indicate:

(a) "It is not righteousness that ye turn your faces to the East and the West; but righteous is he who believes in Allah and the Last Day and the angels and the Scripture and the Prophets; and giveth his wealth for love of Him, to kinsfolk and to orphans and the needy and the wayfarer and those who ask, and sets slaves free; and observeth proper worship and payeth the poor due. And those who keep their treaty when they make one, and the patient in tribulation and adversity and time of stress. Such are they who are sincere. Such are the God-fearing."[3]

(b) "Tell the believing men to lower their gaze and be modest. That is purer for them. Lo! Allah is aware of what they do."[4]

"O ye who believe! Enter not houses other than your own without first announcing your presence and invoking peace upon the folk thereof. That is better for you, that ye may be heedful. And if you find no one therein, still enter not until permission hath been given; and if it be said unto you: Go away again, then go away, for it is purer for you. Allah knoweth what ye do."[5]

(c) "O ye who believe! Guard your duty to Allah, and speak words straight to the point."[6]

(d) "O ye who believe! Be steadfast witnesses for Allah in equity, and let not hatred of any people seduce you that ye deal not justly. Deal justly, that is nearer to your duty. Observe your duty to Allah. Lo! Allah is informed of what ye do."[7]

"And if two parties of believers fall to fighting, then make peace between them. And if one party of them doeth wrong to the other, fight ye that which doeth wrong till it return unto the ordinance of Allah; then, if he return, make peace between them justly, and act equitably. Lo! Allah loveth the equitable. The believers are naught else than brothers. Therefore, make peace between your brethren and observe your duty to Allah that haply you may obtain mercy."[8]

(e) "O ye who believe! Shun much suspicion, for Lo! some suspicion is a crime."[9]

"The (true) believers are those only who believe in Allah and His messenger and afterward doubt not, but strive with wealth and their lives for the cause of Allah. Such are the sincere."[10]

(f) "And that ye do good to parents, and that ye slay not your children because of penury—we provide for you and for them. And approach not the wealth of the orphan save with that which is better, till he reach maturity."[11]

"Thy Lord hath decreed, that ye worship none save Him, and (that ye show) kindness to parents. If one of them or both of them attain old age with thee, say not 'Fie' unto them nor repulse them, but speak unto them a gracious word. And lower unto them the

wing of submission through mercy, and say: My Lord! Have mercy on them both as they did care for me when I was little."[12]

(g) "And those who malign believing men and believing women undeservedly, they bear the guilt of slander and manifest sin."[13]

(h) "Neither defame one another, nor insult one another by nicknames. Bad is the name of lewdness after faith."[14]

"And spy not, neither back-bite one another. Would one of you love to eat the flesh of his dead brother? Ye abhor that so abhor the other! And keep your duty to Allah. Lo Allah is Relenting, Merciful."[15]

(i) "Ah, woe unto worshippers who are heedless of their prayers; who would be seen (at worship) yet refuse small kindnesses."[16]

(j) "O ye who believe! If ye help Allah, He will help you and will make your foot-hold firm."[17]

(k) "He hath written faith upon their hearts and hath strengthened them with a Spirit from Him, and He will bring them into Gardens underneath which rivers flow, wherein they will abide. Allah is well pleased with them, and they are well pleased with Him. They are Allah's party. Lo! is it not Allah's party who are the successful?"[18]

(l) "The wandering Arabs say: We believe. Say (unto them O Muhammad): Ye believe not, but rather say 'We submit', for the faith hath not yet entered into your hearts. Yet, if ye obey Allah and His messenger, He will not withhold from you ought of (the reward of) your deeds. Lo! Allah is forgiving, Merciful."[19]

(m) "Fight in the way of Allah against those who fight against you, but begin not hostilities. Lo! Allah loveth not aggressors."[20]

"Relent not in pursuit of the enemy. If ye are suffering, lo! they suffer even as ye suffer and ye hope from Allah that for which they cannot hope."[21]

"Whoso fighteth in the way of Allah, be he slain or be he victorious, on him We shall bestow a vast reward.[22]"

If *Momin* represents the evolutionary stage which a *Muslim* is to achieve eventually, the question may well be asked: What is the definition of a *Muslim*? Or what are the minimum requirements for being a *Muslim*?

One point must be made clear before answering this question, and that is that everything which pertains to belief and conviction falls in the realm of feeling and emotions, and, therefore, cannot be defined in concrete terms of logical reasoning. Could *Love, Pain, Beauty, Mind, Life, Conscience, Poetry* etc. be defined in concrete and categorical terms? No. Even God, if approached with the instruments of logical reasoning, would always appear to escape definition.

Thus the terms *Muslim, Christian, Hindu* etc. when defined in terms of logical reasoning would always appear to run short of what they actually imply. In order to grasp the definition of *Muslim*, therefore, it is necessary to approach the question with the help of sources of knowledge other than Reason. Indeed if a person were to deny any other source of knowledge than Reason, then the answer to our question would be completely confused, distorted and misleading. A person relying on instinct, intuition and feeling as sources of knowledge in addition to reason, is certainly better equipped to grasp and comprehend the definitions which are never adequate to express fully the reality of the term defined. To define is to limit or to categorise. Since the term *Muslim* if defined would overflow its limitations and categorisation, it could only be defined partially.

The minimum requirement for being a *Muslim*, which is shared in common by all the eminent Muslim legists who hold divergent views with regard to the details of the subject, is that any person who believes in the Unity of God and the Prophetic mission of Muhammad is a *Muslim*. This view is simple and logical and has also been accepted by Ameer Ali, one of the eminent judges of Muslim India.

At any rate, this definition, although simple and logical, is only partial, because the one who believes in the Unity of God and the Prophetic mission of Muhammad must also believe automatically in what has been revealed by God (i.e., the Quran), the Day of Judgement, the Prophets etc. Then again if one believes in the structural principles of Islam (i.e., the Unity of God and the Finality of Muhammad's Prophethood) he must also perform in actual practice the five well-defined *Obligations of the Faith*; nay, still more, he must impose the entire moral discipline of Islam upon himself and bring each and every action of his into conformity with the Law of God, so that his inner self (*Batin*—i.e., belief, conviction, motivation) is perfectly reconciled and harmonised with his outer or manifest self (*Zahir*—i.e., action and behaviour).

But it is clear that no real moral progress can be achieved unless and until we start from the belief in the basic structural and foundational principles of Islam. So the definition of *Muslim* is that belief in God's Unity and Muhammad's Prophethood is only the beginning of a process through which Man can gradually reach higher and purer stages of moral life.

It is usually the mere recitation of the *Kalima* (i.e., the Affirmation of the Unity of God and the Prophetic character of Muhammad) which converts a non-Muslim to Islam, but if his belief is sincere it should gradually unfold and reveal to him higher and purer moral stages, and initiate him further into achieving these stages in his own life. Thus, in spite of his shortcomings and failings as a human being, if a person were simply to believe truly, sincerely and honestly in the foundational principles of Islam, he remains a *Muslim* because there is always a possibility that his inner belief would unfold within his being and goad him towards achieving higher and purer stages of moral life.

This principle is also illustrated in one of the *Traditions*. It is reported that once in a battle against the enemies of Islam, Khalid bin Walid overpowered an idolater. He was about to kill him when the idolater raised his hands and exclaimed: "There is no god but God and Muhammad is the Prophet of God." Khalid bin Walid, however, did not pay any heed to his exclamation and killed him instantaneously. When the Holy Prophetheard of whathad happened

he was terribly distressed. He demanded Khalid bin Walid's explanation saying: "What right had you to kill a person who had recited the *Kalima* and become a *Musalman*?" Khalid bin Walid replied that the idolater had recited the *Kalima* not because he really believed in Islam but only because he was anxious to save his life. "How could you tell", asked the Holy Prophet angrily, "whether he really believed or was only anxious to save his life? Had you entered his heart to find out whether his belief was sincere or not?" Khalid bin Walid could not reply and remained silent. The incident had upset the Holy Prophet to such an extent that he did not speak to Khalid bin Walid for many days.

The mystics and philosophers of Islam have written a lot on the intellectual difficulties of advancing even from the stage of 'complete denial' (*la'ila*) to 'affirmation' of the Unity of God (*il'allah*). The stage of 'complete denial' implies the rejection of all *idols* (intellectual as well as other) on which a person tends to rely in life and which tend to be infinitely numerous and endlessly recurring. They can assume the form of Reason, Lust, Wealth, Nationalism, Security, Ambition, Power—anything which interferes between Man and God. If one were to try to pass through the stage of 'complete denial' intellectually it would be impossible. It is, therefore, only through *Love* that Man is enabled to take a *leap* from the stage of 'complete denial' to that of 'affirmation' of the Unity of God. Thus in the opinion of the mystics and philosophers of Islam, without *Love* it is even difficult to be a *Muslim*, let alone to attempt to achieve higher and purer stages of moral life and to realise the stage of *Momin*.

When the Muslim theologians., *Ulema* and legists maintain that the *Muslim* is one who believes in Muhammad as a Prophet and who belongs to the Muslim Community; or that any and every person is a *Muslim* who says: '*There is no god but God and Muhammad is the Prophet of God*'; or that a *Muslim* is one who in addition to the belief in the Unity of God and Muhammad's Prophethood, performs in actual practice the well-defined *Obligations of the Faith*; or that a *Muslim* is one who believes not only in God and Muhammad but also in the Quran, angels, Prophets, Day of Judgement etc.; or that a *Muslim* is one who believes in God and the HolyProphet, along with a number of additional beliefs which are necessary—this by no means implies that there is a disagreement or confusion in the minds

of the theologians, *Ulema* or legists about the definition of a *Muslim*. The theologians etc. hold divergent views on this subject mainly because they are endeavouring to determine precisely the exact point at which a person could be called a *Muslim* in the full and strict sense of the term, after the development which follows the recitation of the *Kalima*.

To some inner belief and conviction (*Iman*) is alone sufficient to make a person *Muslim*. Others, however, go a step further and say that unless and until actions and behaviour (*Aml*) of a person conform to his inner belief and conviction (*Iman*) he lacks the necessary qualifications for being regarded as a *Muslim* in the full and strict sense of the term. At any rate, they all agree that the process of entering into Islam begins with the recitation of the *Kalima* or the belief in the Unity of God and Muhammad's Prophethood. Their disagreement derives only from their attempt to venture beyond the elementary and practical definition of a *Muslim* and to define with the strict and quibbling logic of mediaeval minds, the exact point in the believer's moral development at which he could be called a *Muslim* in the fullest and most perfect sense of the term. Therefore, to hold that there is such a severe disagreement among the *Ulema*, theologians and legists of Islam that no one can say in practical terms what a *Muslim* is, or that the whole of our theological and legal tradition is completely confused on this point, would be an absurd and erroneous conclusion.

In recent times, the Munir Committee Report seems to have attempted to define *Muslim* objectively and in rational terms. The Committee, which consisted of the judges of the Courts of law of Pakistan, were in fact acting as a Court of Inquiry into the Punjab Disturbances of 1953. They were investigating the causes and circumstances which led to the riots in 1953 in West Punjab, but during the course of their investigations they were called upon to express opinion on certain matters of Islamic theology and jurisprudence in which, it is respectfully submitted, they were neither qualified nor trained to express opinion. The judges of our Courts of law are trained in the British legal system and they have no knowledge of and are obviously unconcerned with the intricacies and refinements of Islamic theology and jurisprudence. They, therefore, never claimed to hold a court of inquiry in the capacity of *Qazis* or

Muftis, and yet felt obliged to express opinion on matters of Islamic theology and jurisprudence over which they had no jurisdiction.

They raised the question: What is the definition of a *Muslim*? in the course of their investigations and examined a few *Ulema*. But instead of deducing an answer to their question (i.e., the minimum requirement for being a *Muslim*) from the evidence which was recorded before them through any of the methods known to Islamic jurisprudence (e.g., *Qiyas*—Analogy, *Istihsan*—Preference, *Masalihal-mursala wa'listislah*—Public Good, *Istidlal*—Inference; actually they could not have applied any of these modes of reasoning because of their unfamiliarity with this field), they deemed it fit to let the evidence stand in the Report as it was recorded and they arrived at the conclusion that there existed considerable confusion in the minds of our *Ulema* about the definition of a *Muslim*.

It is respectfully submitted that the conclusion arrived at by the Munir Committee is erroneous and misleading. The Munir Committee was constituted of our judges who had no jurisdiction to express opinion on theological matters. (There is no precedent in British law of secular judges attempting to express opinion on a theological point). But since they have expressed their opinion on this particular theological question, then their opinion as eminent judges of our Courts of law may be regarded as authoritative although it was expressed in their capacity only as members of an Inquiry Committee.

The effect of the opinion held in the Munir Committee Report is, that the term *Muslim* remains undefined. What then, it may be asked, is the justification for striving for, establishing and claiming Pakistan as the home and the State of the *Muslim nation*? The conclusion arrived at by the Munir Committee as regards this question seems to strike at the very root of the Ideology of Pakistan. It is not only inexpedient and against public policy, but manifestly erroneous.

It has been stated that the *Momin* represents an evolutionary stage in the moral progress of a *Muslim*. Now the question may be put: What is the definition of *Momin*?

In order to answer this question it is necessary to refer to Iqbal, for he is one of those Muslim thinkers who has endeavoured to approach this question in the midst of the twentieth century revival of Islam in the Indian sub-continent.

It has already been pointed out that God and *Momin* are inter-dependent and complementary forces. It is, therefore, essential to comprehend Iqbal's conception of God, the Universe and Man before enumerating the attributes of a *Momin*.

Actually, it was the study of the early Islam (particularly the alive, vigorous, and personal conception of the God of Islam) of the simple and straightforward Arab that had unfolded Iqbal to himself. Naturally he rejected the 'fixed God' of the later Islamic mysticism which emphasised fatalism, renunciation and other-worldliness, and which taught Man to surrender in the sense of dissolving and annihilating himself in the *Pure Spirit*. Iqbal's interest in early Islam had brought him into contact with the original Quranic conception of God, the God who is a living personality, who wills, moves, continuously creates and is even capable of changing His mind. (Accordingly Iqbal likes addressing God by His personal name *Allah*). He is the Perfect Individual "closed off as an ego, peerless and unique."

From God, conceived as Ultimate Ego by Iqbal, only egos proceed. "The creative energy" says Iqbal, "of Ultimate Ego, in whom deed and thought are identical, functions as ego-unities. The world, in all its details, from the mechanical movement of what we call the atom of matter to the free movement of thought in the human ego, is the self-revelation of the 'Great I am'. Every atom of Divine energy, however low in the scale of existence, is an ego. But there are degrees in the expression of egohood. Throughout the entire gamut of being runs the gradually rising note of egohood until it reaches its perfection in man. That is why the Quran declares the Ultimate Ego to be nearer to man than his own neck-vein. Like pearls do we live and move and have our being in the perpetual flow of Divine life."[23]

The Universe, therefore, is not a block universe, immobile and incapable of change. It is an ever growing universe—for God as Ultimate Ego keeps on adding more and still more into it.

What, then, is Iqbal's conception of Man? He, too, is an ego making a constant effort 'to be' something, and seeking every opportunity to sharpen his activity in order to acquire 'a more fundamental I am.' He, therefore, is active, cognitive and constantly desiring. He is free, creative and immortal. Everything that helps the fortification of his personality is good, and everything that weakens it, is bad. He is superior to nature because he has *personality*, and as a personality he possesses a free will. He is capable of doubt and disobedience. ("Man's first act of disobedience was also his first act of free choice," says Iqbal). Nevertheless he is able to fortify his personality. Since God and Man are both creative in the universal process of progressive change, Man becomes a *co-worker* with God—he responds to God's commands, takes initiative and acts.

Iqbal's Man must always remain individualistic. He is in essence a spiritual being realising himself in space and time, and can only be apprehended as a living force possessing rights and duties in the social organism to which he belongs. Here Iqbal supplements the idea of Individual Ego with his doctrine of Collective Ego, conceiving thereby a community of unique individuals—a tangible whole embracing parts.

The doctrine of Collective Ego had a profound influence on the development of his social and political ideas. He applied his metaphysics and ethics to a particular and exclusive society—a society which should have a well defined creed and a capacity to enlarge its membership by example and persuasion. "Such a society," he said, "according to my belief is Islam." Islam, in his opinion, recognises "the contact of the ideal with the real, says 'yes' to the world of matter and points the way to master it with a view to discover a basis for a realistic regulation of life."[24]

The important feature of Iqbal's conception of Man is that Man's awareness of God as his *co-worker* sharpens Man's understanding of the necessity for his activity, gives him dignity, and fills him with strength, courage, confidence, a sense of righteousness and hope. As a result all the conflicts and struggles of Man assume an ethical character. Man can and must create a better world because God is by his side as a *co-worker*.

So much for Man, but what is the *Ideal Man* of Iqbal? He is the person who can fortify his personality. He is the *Momin*, the *Free* (*Mard-i-Hur*), the *Righteous* (*Mard-i-Haq*), the *Sage* (*Mard-i-Bazurg*) and the *Godly* (*Mard-i-Khuda*).

In the opinion of Iqbal the cultivation of the following attributes could fortify the personality of Man and help him to achieve in this life the stage of moral development called the *Momin*.

Love

It is the basic inner (*Batini*) quality of the *Momin* which sustaius Faith (*Iman*) in the Unity of God and thus unifies and harmonises the thoughts and activities of the *Momin*. It is a mode of knowledge and a higher form of experience. It includes love of God, His Prophet, His Law and the whole of His Creation.

According to Iqbal, the intensity of desires is heightened by Love. Love is in essence free and, therefore, it has the capacity to fortify personality.

Defining Love, Iqbal maintains: "The word is used in a very wide sense and means the desire to assimilate and to absorb. Its highest form is the creation of values and ideals and the endeavour to realise them. Love individualises the lover as well as the beloved. The effort to realise the most unique individuality individualises the seeker and implies the individuality of the sought, for nothing else would satisfy the nature of the seeker." Hence the *agony of separation* (*Firaq*) is transformed into the *joy of distinctness* in Iqbal's conception of Love.

Love is the real basis of all religious, moral, spiritual and temporal life. Iqbal divides religious life into three stages: (a) *Faith* (i.e., submission to discipline); (b) *Thought* (i.e., a rational understanding of the discipline and the ultimate source of its authority); and (c) *Discovery* (i.e., the desire to come into direct contact with the Ultimate Reality). "It is here" Iqbal holds, "that religion becomes a matter of personal assimilation of life and power; and the individual achieves a free personality, not by releasing himself from the

fetters of the law but by discovering the ultimate source of the law within the depth of his consciousness."[25]

Religion, to Iqbal, is the *Momin's* total attitude—intellectual, emotional and practical towards the Universe as a whole. It is neither mere thought, nor mere feeling, nor mere action; it is the expression of his entire self.

Conservatism in religion is dangerous just as in other departments of human activity, for, in the opinion of Iqbal: "It destroys the ego's creative freedom and closes up the paths of fresh spiritual enterprise." The *Momin*, therefore, has an infinite capacity for *tolerance* and respect for the beliefs and convictions of others.

Prayer is an expression of the *Momin's* inner yearning for a response from God. It is a unique process of discovery. It is the *Momin's* escape from mechanism to freedom. It is spiritual culture, which like intellectual and aesthetic culture is a means for achieving a more perfect and purposeful life. Prayer is the means by which the *Momin* continuously discovers values, and the source from which he derives the strength to work to express these values in the context of the material world.

Iqbal insists on the socialisation of spiritual illumination through associative prayer because the spirit of all true prayer is social. Thus the *Momin* achieves the real object of prayer through congregational prayer i.e., an association of *Momins* who "animated by the same aspiration concentrate themselves on a single object and open up their inner selves to the working of a single impulse."[26]

Posture of body, Iqbal thinks, determines the attitude of mind; and one particular direction in the congregation secures the unity of feeling and creates a sense of social equality.

Freedom

The *Momin* is free and through his Freedom he helps in the march of humanity. His Freedom does not imply releasing himself from the fetters of law but Freedom means fortification of his personality through the acceptance of the discipline of Islam upon

himself as well as upon the Community. He possesses freedom of thought and action. He is politically free.

Disinterestedness (Faqr)

There is no one word in English to convey the exact meaning of the term *Faqr*. It indicates the attitude of mind that enables the *Momin* to strive for goodness without caring for the pleasure or joy of its achievement. It is an attitude of complete detachment from and superiority to one's worldly possessions. It makes the character of the *Momin* distinctive. It is an expression of actions motivated by no other desire than to fulfil the Law of God for its own sake. It is an expression of direct consciousness of duty born out of Love.

Iqbal uses the symbol of the *Eagle* for interpreting his conception of Islamic *Faqr*. The *Momin* like the *Eagle*, is proud and self-respecting; he, therefore, would never live on what has been hunted by someone other than himself. In other words, the *Momin* only lives on his own endeavours and earnings in life. For him every profession or occupation is forbidden unless and until it involves labour (mental or physical). He, therefore, has the conception of the *dignity of labour*. In his view the true parasites of society are those who do no work themselves, and live on the struggles of others. In the ideal society of *Momins* there would be no such parasites.

Like the *Eagle* again, the *Momin* is disassociated and detached. He soars high, likes privation (in spite of taking part in worldly activity) and is sharp-sighted. He does not indulge in boastful talking; is polite, courteous, and modest; he speaks little but acts. He is pure-hearted and pure-eyed. He is charming, frank and outspoken. He always stands by the Truth.

Courage

Without physical and moral Courage, Man cannot achieve anything in the world. The weak succumb to obstacles. To the *Momin*, however, obstacles provide chances for the manifestation of his potential virtues. Courage is the secret of the *Momin*. It is his triumph over fear of anything other than God. With Love, Courage is strengthened. Courage is constant striving

against the forces of evil. Its goal is martyrdom (*Shahadat*) for the sake of God as demonstrated by Husain, the grandson of the Holy Prophet, the *Imamus Shuhada*.

It implies entirely personal effort and struggle. Courage in the *Momin* also denotes his capacity to suffer and to endure. He is strong-willed, tough and determined. It is courage, toughness, forgiveness, purity and power that constitute a *Momin*. The *Momin* believes in *living dangerously*, defying all powers which tend to obstruct the achievement of Right. It is a strong man's frankness, it is the tolerance of a strong man's faith. The *Momin* is the soldier of God. He fights for the sake of God alone. He is the protector, the shield, the blade and the steel. He is the scale of justice.

Creative Activity

When all life is a creative movement, a constant effort, an unceasing quest, when it is original, essential and spontaneous, then naturally action becomes a prominent feature of the *Momin's* character. It is only through creative action that the *Momin* becomes a *co-worker* with God and belongs to God's party.

Historical Context

The *Momin* has a perception into the trends of history. He is able to change, mould, shape and cast history in accordance with his ideals. History is the fruit of his initiative. He creates history.

What are the factors which cause the deterioration of human personality? To Iqbal the all-inclusive cause is *stagnation*, that is the opposite of creative activity. It implies the absence of activity, or lethargy. *Stagnation* gives birth to fear, treachery, sedition, cowardice, begging or asking (not only for the means of livelihood but also for thoughts, habits etc. from the others) imitating, and finally slavery. Slavery distorts character and weakens personality. The *Momin*, therefore, can only be brought up in a spirit of freedom.

The activity of the *Momin* is vital because his will has been sharpened by the creative assurance that "the world is not something to be merely seen or known through concepts but something to be

made and remade by continuous action." This realisation is a moment of supreme bliss and also a moment of the greatest trial for the *Momin*.

There is no object in an academic discussion on the attributes of the *Momin* unless and until there are possibilities of creating means and circumstances under which he could breathe, live and move among us again as he breathed, lived and moved in the early history of Islam. It is also necessary for the successful moral development of Pakistan in contemporary history that the *Momin* is re-cast and re-lives in this country.

Could the mere teaching of Theology at schools and Universities transform our younger generations into *Momins*? The observations of K.G. Saiyidain, the eminent Indian Muslim educationist are worth quoting: "A good deal of discussion that has been going on regarding the place and importance of moral (and religious) education in schools is merely concerned with the teaching of dogma and ritual and a large majority of the text-books used only attempt to do that and no more. Now, there is undoubtedly a place for their teaching in a comprehensive scheme of moral and religious education but the problem is really much bigger and deeper, and Iqbal takes the correct view when he says: 'Goodness is not a matter of compulsion; it is the self's free surrender to the moral ideal and arises out of a willing co-operation of free egos. A being whose movements are wholly determined cannot produce goodness. Freedom is thus seen to be a condition of goodness.' The quotation brings out two very important principles underlying moral education. Firstly, education cannot produce or stimulate genuine moral behaviour by teaching a set of ready-made moral maxims which the students are expected to act upon mechanically and without question. Morality involves choice and free-will. It is only through personal experience, which is guaranteed a reasonable degree of freedom, that we can work out, thoughtfully and often with travail, a code of effective personal morality. With such a background of experience, gained in the give-and-take of everyday social intercourse, theoretical moral maxims cannot be transformed into persistent motive forces of conduct. Secondly, the quotation underlines the significant relationship of *moral* to *social* behaviour. Morality cannot be taught or learnt in isolation; it arises out of the 'willing *co-operation* of free

egos' which implies that the schools must provide full opportunities for social life and social experience and must utilise in their day-to-day work the healthy motives which operate in community life. All the educational movements which introduce social motives and methods in schools and offer scope for co-operative work done tend to '*moralise*' the process of education and should, therefore, be welcomed."[27]

Since mysticism as an institution which provided spiritual and moral training in the early phases of Islamic history is a spent force and has practically died long ago, it is essential that our educational institutions should inculcate and encourage the dissemination of the attributes and moral virtues of the *Momin* among our youth. Youth fraternities (male and female) might be formed and constituted in our schools, universities and military academies on the basis of the moral virtues enumerated above. If these fraternities could disseminate and engender the virtues of the *Momin* among our youth, then we could hope to see an outburst of new and creative life among our people, an enthusiastic response to the call to be *co-workers* with God in building a good and just society in our land, and the development of free, loving, courageous and vital people committed to devoting their lives to the service of the common good and energetically working to find solutions to all the many problems which today harass, blind and frustrate us.

CHAPTER 8

PAKISTAN AND HINDUISM

The Muslims claimed Pakistan firstly, because they felt that they were distinct from the Hindus, and secondly, because they desired to develop themselves on the lines of their own distinctive culture. Thus it would be wrong to say that the basis on which Pakistan was founded was *Communalistic Fanaticism*, or the anxiety of the Muslims to establish an *Islamic Theocracy* in the areas where they constituted a numerical majority.

Pakistan was not founded on the philosophy of *hatred* of the Hindu. "A community" says Iqbal, "which is inspired by feeling of *ill*-will towards other communities is low and ignoble. I entertain the highest respect for the customs, laws, religious and social institutions of other communities. Nay, it is my duty, according to the teaching of the Quran, even to defend their places of worship if need be. Yet I love the communal group which is the source of my life and behaviour; and which has formed me what I am, by giving me its religion, its literature, its thought, its culture, and thereby recreating its whole past, as a living operative factor, in my present consciousness."[1]

It is, then, this higher aspect of Communalism that may be regarded as the basis on which Pakistan was founded. The value of this type of Communalism has also been recognised by the authors of the Nehru Committee Report (1928), for when discussing the separation of Sind from Bombay Presidency they observed: "To say from the larger viewpoint of nationalism that no communal provinces should be created is, in a way, equivalent to saying from the still wider international viewpoint that there should be no separate nations. Both these statements have a measure of truth in them. But the staunchest internationalist recognises that without the fullest national autonomy it is extraordinarily difficult to create the international State. So also without the fullest cultural autonomy, and

communalism in its better aspect as culture it will be difficult to create a harmonious nation."[2]

Pakistan was, therefore, established on the principle of Muslim Nationalism, i.e., the securing of complete and absolute Muslim national and cultural autonomy. The 'Two-nation Theory' was put forward as an exposition of this very principle. Some critics of Pakistan attempt to assert that Quaid-i-Azam invented this theory, and that it had no true historical basis in Indian Islam. But in reality the problem of the two nations originally came into existence soon after the Muslims entered India as conquerors. The earliest account of the distinction between the Hindus and the Muslims has been provided by Al-Beruni, who visited India in the company of Sultan Mahmud in the ninth century. He writes in his famous work entitled *Kitabul Hind* as follows about the differences he observed between the two Communities: "The Hindus entirely differ from us (the Muslims) in every respect, many a subject appearing intricate and obscure which would be perfectly clear if there were more connections between us."[3]

Concerning the contrasts he observed between the customs, habits and manners of the Hindus and the Muslims, he says: "One might think that they had intentionally changed them into the opposite, for our customs do not resemble theirs, but are the very reverse; and if ever a custom of theirs resembles one of ours, it has certainly just the opposite meaning."[4] And he enumerates the following reasons for the complete and entire isolation of the Muslims as a Community from the Hindus: "All their (Hindus') fanaticism is directed against those who do not belong to them—against all foreigners. They call them *malechha*, i.e., impure, and forbid having any connection with them, be it by inter-marriage or by any other kind of relationship, or by sitting, eating and drinking with them, because thereby, they think they would be polluted. They consider as impure anything which touches the fire and water of a foreigner, and no household can exist without these two elements. They are not allowed to receive anybody who does not belong to them even if he wished it, or was inclined to their religion. This renders any connection with them quite impossible, and constitutes the widest gulf between us and them."[5]

These thoughts were expressed one thousand years ago. The history of the Indian sub-continent shows us that numerous unsuccessful attempts were made to solve this problem of the isolation of the two Communities from each other. In the sixteenth century, the Emperor Akbar renounced Islam in an effort to amalgamate the two Communities, but he failed mainly because the two Communities showed no inclination to merge themselves into one another willingly. Then in the seventeenth century, the Emperor Aurangzeb tried the alternative method of attempting to impose strictly the laws of the ruling Muslim minority upon the unwilling Hindu majority. This attempt also failed because the subject Hindu majority would not accept it. In the nineteenth century after the decline of the power of the Mughals, and when India had fallen into the hands of the British, Syed Ahmad Khan recognised the seriousness of the same problem. Later on in the beginning of the twentieth century, Maulana Muhammad Ali also said that there were two nations in India. Iqbal went a step further and vigorously proclaimed the need of a separate State for the Muslim nation in the Indian sub-continent. In the end, it was Quaid-i-Azam who solved the problem which had appeared insoluble even to such autocratic and all-powerful Emperors as Akbar and Aurangzeb.

Quaid-i-Azam observed: "The Hindus and the Muslims belong to two different religious philosophies, social customs, literatures. They neither inter-marry nor inter-dine together, and indeed, they belong to two different civilisations which are based mainly on conflicting ideas and conceptions. . . . A Muslim according to the Hindu religion and philosophy becomes an outcast and he becomes a *malechha*, and the Hindus cease to have anything to do with him socially, religiously and culturally or in any other way. He, therefore, belongs to a different order, not only religious, but social and he has lived in that distinctly separate and antagonistic social order, religiously, socially and culturally. It is now more than a thousand years that the bulk of the Muslims have lived in a different world, in a different society, in a different philosophy and a different faith."[6]

There is a thousand years of history between the observations of Al-Beruni and the above extracts from the speeches of Quaid-i-Azam. It is quite apparent that the Hindus and the Muslims were not able to come close to one another even in one thousand years of living

together. Clearly it is not possible to say that Quaid-i-Azam invented the problem and the theory of the Two Nations.

At any rate, it would be worthwhile to probe into and critically examine some of the reasons why the Hindus were hostile and opposed to the Muslim demand for the establishment of Pakistan on the basis which has already been stated.

The Hindu leaders believed and the Hindu Press put out propaganda to the effect that the independent Muslim State would be a *Theocratic* State, that it would annihilate the non-Muslim minorities, form alliances with adjoining Muslim States, revive the *Pan-Islamic* movement and become a menace to Hindu India. One of the British supporters of Hindu Nationalism, namely Edward Thompson, even went so far as to put the suggestion in the Hindu mind that the creation of a Muslim State in the North-West would bring back the days when the waves of the raiding Muslim armies swept down the plains of India.[7] Edward Thompson seems to have forgotten that India's more recent *invaders* came by the sea, and that the Second World War has shown that India is more vulnerable to a Japanese or possibly a Red Chinese incursion from the East and North-East.

Anyway, in order to dispel the fear of the Hindus that the Muslims of the North-West would join the Muslims from beyond the Frontier and invade Hindu India, Iqbal advanced a 'joint defence' proposal. He said in 1930: "The North-West Indian Muslims will prove the best defenders of India against a foreign invasion, be that invasion the one of ideas or of bayonets. The Punjab with fifty-six per cent Muslim population supplies fifty-four per cent of the total combatant troops in the Indian army, and if the nineteen thousand Gurkhas recruited from the independent State of Nepal are excluded, the Punjab contingent amounts to sixty-two per cent of the whole Indian army. This percentage does not take into account nearly six thousand combatants supplied to the Indian army by the North-West Frontier Province and Baluchistan. From this you can easily calculate the possibilities of North-West Indian Muslims in regard to the defence of India against foreign aggression. . . . I have no doubt that if a Federal Government is established, Muslim Federal States will willingly agree, for purposes of India's defence to the creation of neutral Indian military and naval forces. Such a neutral military

force for the defence of India was a reality in the days of the Mughal Rule. Indeed in the time of Akbar the Indian frontier was, on the whole, defended by armies officered by Hindu generals. I am perfectly sure that the scheme of a neutral Indian army, based on a federated India, will intensify Muslim patriotic feeling, and finally set at rest the suspicion, if any, of Indian Muslims joining Muslims from beyond the frontier in the event of an invasion."[8]

The other reasons why the Hindus were hostile to and opposed the Muslim demand for the establishment of Pakistan were that it would lead to the partition of India, which, in the words of Gandhi, amounted to a *vivisection* or, in the words of C. Rajgopalachari, it meant *cutting the baby into two* or *cutting the mother cow into two halves.*[9] The Hindu leaders also suspected that the Muslim State would serve as a tool of British Imperialism and thereby lay chains on the freedom of India.

It is now a number of years since Pakistan came into being; but she has neither become a *Theocratic* State, nor has she annihilated the non-Muslim minorities. Although she has formed alliances with some of the adjoining Muslim States, the idea of reviving the *Pan-Islamic* movement with aggressive designs against Hindu India has never crossed the minds of the Muslims of Pakistan. It would, therefore, be absurd to think that the Hindus regard the establishment of Pakistan as a menace to them.

Then, are the Hindu leaders so credulous and superstitious as to consider the partition of the Indian sub-continent as *vivisection* or *cutting the baby* or *mother cow into two halves*? Indeed the Hindu leaders may have advanced these analogies at one time to rouse the religious feelings of the Hindu masses against the Muslim demand for Pakistan, but it would certainly be absurd to think that the Hindu leaders still loathe, are horrified by or hate the wretched Muslims for having actually committed the beastly crime of vivisecting or cutting *the baby* or *the mother cow* instead of the partitioning of the Indian sub-continent on a geographical basis.

Again, it would be absurd to think that the Hindu leaders suspect that Pakistan is serving as a tool of British Imperialism and thereby laying chains on the freedom of India, particularly when

they are fully aware that British Imperialism is in a state of being wound up and that India is as free and independent as Pakistan to pursue her internal and external policies in accordance with her own needs and requirements.

Why then does India still continue to follow a policy of hostility towards Pakistan? Why does she endeavour through all possible means (even an actual armed aggression in 1965) at her disposal to undo Pakistan? The answer to these questions appears to be simple: the Hindus have not yet been reconciled to the idea of partitioning the Indian sub-continent. But in reality the problem is definitely more complex and deep. It may be that India does not allow herself to become reconciled to the idea of the partition of the subcontinent because the establishment of Pakistan interferes with or hinders her claim to the leadership of the entire Asiatic and African world. Pakistan and her alliances with some of the adjoining Muslim States are a stumbling block against the realisation of India's dream of a neutralised South Asia and Africa.

Indeed as a conscientious, polite and courteous neighbour Pakistan has no right to challenge the validity or to criticise the romantic claims and dreams of India, but Pakistan has every right to defend her position (particularly when she realises that India's claims and dreams do not suit her needs and requirements) and to protest that if she differs with India in certain respects, that is no justification for India to pursue a policy of undoing her.

What are the means which India adopts for undoing Pakistan? It is essentially her unfriendly, uncompromising and hostile attitude with regard to the solution of the Indo-Pakistan disputes.

The outstanding dispute between India and Pakistan is the dispute regarding the accession of the States. At the partition of the Indian subcontinent, the States with Hindu population being surrounded by Indian territory, acceded to India; whereas the States with Muslim population adjacent to Pakistan, acceded to Pakistan. However, the accession of three States—Junagadh, Hyderabad and Kashmir remains undecided and leads to bitterness between India and Pakistan. The States of Junagadh and Hyderabad had been occupied by India through actual armed assaults. In Kashmir

(a predominantly Muslim State with a Hindu ruler) armies of India and Pakistan had formerly been fighting an undeclared localised war.

With regard to the Kashmir dispute, the sympathies of the United Nations and the opinion of the world are certainly in favour of Pakistan who has consistently taken a moral stand, i.e., to allow the people of Kashmir to decide for themselves through the means of a free and fair plebiscite whether they desire to join Pakistan or India.

India realises that if a free and fair plebiscite is held, Kashmir being predominantly Muslim may vote for joining Pakistan. India also realises that Kashmir is a question of life and death to Pakistan (particularly West Pakistan) because all her rivers take their source from Kashmir. But since India is consistently following a policy of undoing Pakistan, she is absolutely uncompromising and turns her face aside at the very suggestion of holding a plebiscite in Kashmir.

India monetarily sponsors and instigates a neighbouring State of Pakistan to carry on propaganda for the establishment of *Pakhtoonistan* and supports certain misguided, sick and old Indian nationalist elements within Pakistan to serve as her agents and tools in order to disintegrate West Pakistan. On the other hand, taking advantage of the trade restrictions between India and Pakistan, she actively supports the secessionist elements in East Pakistan because an economically dislocated East Pakistan would obviously be easy to disintegrate and break off from Pakistan. She would deliberately prolong the solution of the dispute regarding the distribution of river and canal water between India and Pakistan so that Pakistan may be economically disrupted. She would not even hesitate to avail of the services of the Communists by infiltrating them into Pakistan so that they could support and back the *Pindi Conspiracy*, the object of which was to usurp the very State in Pakistan. She has already fought against Pakistan in the Rann of Cutch, and subsequently, in September 1965 attacked Pakistan unsuccessfully with all her military strength. In 1970, she disallowed Pakistan to fly over her territory and consequently disrupted the vital air-link between East and West Pakistan. She supported the secessionists in East Pakistan during the general elections, sent armed infiltrators in that part of Pakistan and vir-

tually carried on an undeclared war so that East Pakistan could be made to secede from Pakistan. At the same time India spends large sums on her defence, is endeavouring to create the atom bomb, and has entered in a Security Pact with the Soviet Union (1971), although it is against her ostensibly declared policy to attack anybody or to join military blocs.

Can we hope for a *rapprochement* with India? So long as the present political leadership remains in power in India and so long as there is no change in the international political situation, there is little likelihood of an understanding or a *rapprochement* with India. Unless changes in the international situation force a change in India's attitude to Pakistan, or unless younger and more tolerant leaders achieve power in India, we could have little hope for better and improved relations with India.

Under the present circumstances then, how should the offensive of Hinduism against Pakistan be combated? We must simply wait patiently and avoid to provide cause of grievance to India. We should consistently adopt a friendly, compromising and charitable attitude towards India with regard to the Indo-Pakistan disputes. We must assure India that we are facing the same kinds of problems of economic reconstruction that she is facing herself, and that we have no aggressive designs against her. Meanwhile we must wait patiently and watch the development of the international political situation. It is very likely that India shall have to change her present policies towards Pakistan in the light of new developments which may take place within India and in the world in the near future.

In such circumstances, we cannot do anything except to watch the development patiently. We should try to solve the Indo-Pakistan disputes which can be solved as early as possible in a spirit of friendship. It is necessary for the solution of the economic problems of both India and Pakistan that they should be on good terms with each other, because so long as the Indo-Pakistan disputes remain undecided and the two countries keep on preparing to go to war against each other, neither Government would be in a position to adopt a programme of economic reconstruction.

CHAPTER 9

SELF-RELIANCE THROUGH ALIGNMENT AND BILATERALISM

It is obvious that from the moment of their creation in August, 1947, the relations between Pakistan and India had been strained. In the spheres of politics, economics as well as defence, there existed no co-operation between these two countries. India never whole-heartedly accepted the Partition and made persistent efforts to undo it by paralysing Pakistan at the very beginning. At the time of Partition, the western boundary of East Pakistan was so drawn as to leave all the jute mills just a little way within India. India produced all the high grade coal for railways and was well established as a manufacturer of steel. On the other hand, in the areas constituting Pakistan there had been virtually no industrial development. The Radcliffe Award had created the disputes over Kashmir and distribution of river as well as canal waters. Although most of the differences between the two countries were important in themselves, the Kashmir dispute paled all the other differences into insignificance.

In these circumstances, obviously the first consideration which attracted the attention of the political leadership of Pakistan was to preserve the newly carved out country, to safeguard and to defend it particularly from India. The geographical set up of Pakistan placed her both in the Middle East as well as South East Asia.

In order to make herself strong defensively and economically, Pakistan looked around for friends. Pakistan was one of the first few countries of the world which recognised People's China at the very outset and developed friendly relations with her. But People's China had gained independence only in 1949 and was in the process of organising herself. There were of course the Soviet Union and the United States. In 1949, Prime Minister Liaquat Ali Khan received an invitation to visit Moscow, but he did not go there. The Soviet attitude in the Security Council towards the

Kashmir question, which in its earlier stages had been one of indifference, eventually became one of positive antipathy towards Pakistan. Liaquat Ali Khan visited the United States in 1950, but his statements were to the effect that Pakistan genuinely desired to pursue a foreign policy of friendly relations with all the nations, uninfluenced by the inter-bloc struggle going on in the world.[1]

In July, 1951, came the first threat of an Indian invasion when almost all of India's armed forces and her mechanised divisions were concentrated on the borders of Pakistan. This threat did not develop any further. But the political leadership of Pakistan realised that although Pakistan had made extensive purchases of arms at high prices in the foreign markets, risking a severe strain on her economy, she was weaker than India. By continuing her military occupation of Kashmir, India violated international agreements to which she was committed as well as defied the United Nations. The apprehensions of Pakistan were genuine. With India in possession of Kashmir, Pakistan was strategically encircled. In the event of war with a superior power like India, how was Pakistan to protect herself? Her own armed strength was insufficient. The United Nations was not an effective instrument for the maintenance of world peace. People's China, although friendly towards Pakistan, was involved in her internal organisation. The Soviet Union had definitely adopted pro-Indian attitude. There were countries like Yugoslavia and Turkey which were receiving military aid from the United States. The United States also appeared interested in having a defence pact with Pakistan. What could one expect from Pakistan in her desperate situation?

In 1952-53 Pakistan faced serious food shortage resulting in an economic crisis. The country's revenues fell catastrophically and drastic cuts had to be imposed on Government plans, including that on defence, which had to be curtailed at the risk of Pakistan's security.

Pakistan had so far tried to build up her defence with her own resources. But the expenditure was so enormous that it was imposing an increasingly burdensome strain on her economy. As a result, the development of her resources had to be sacrificed to the primary need of building up her defence.

On 19th February, 1954 a mutual defence pact was announced between Pakistan and Turkey, and shortly after Pakistan entered into a military aid agreement with the United States. The Turco-Pakistani Pact eventually matured in 1955 into what was called the Baghdad Pact. The other parties to this treaty were Iran, Iraq, Turkey and the United Kingdom. (This pact subsequently came to be known as the Central Treaty Organisation or CENTO when Iraq withdrew from it in 1958).

On 5th March, 1959 the Pakistan-United States Bilateral Agreement of Co-operation was signed at Ankara. According to Article I of this agreement, the United States undertook the responsibility of taking appropriate action, in the event of aggression against Pakistan. Under Article II, the United States affirmed that she would continue to furnish military and economic assistance to Pakistan, on an agreed basis, with a view to helping in the preservation of her national independence and territorial integrity and the promotion of her economic development.

On 8th September, 1954 at Manila, Pakistan signed the pact called South East Asia Treaty Organisation (SEATO). The parties to this agreement were Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand, Australia, New Zealand, France, the United Kingdom and the United States. In this agreement Pakistan was committed to resisting aggression of every description and from any quarter whereas the United States intended the pact to be of an exclusively anti-Communist character.

The object of Pakistan in entering into these treaties was only to strengthen her position militarily, particularly against the threat of Indian aggression. Obviously Pakistan held no aggressive designs against the Soviet Union or People's China. The position of Pakistan was throughout perfectly understood by People's China but not by the Soviet Union whose attitude progressively hardened towards Pakistan. In 1955 Bulganin and Khrushchev went to the extent of declaring that they regarded Kashmir as part of India.[2] The price which Pakistan had to pay for following a policy of alignment with the Western bloc was not only increase in the burden of debts, but also that she alienated all the possibilities of developing friendly relations with the Soviet Union or Eastern bloc.

The logic of the policy of alignment was to lessen the burden from Pakistan's economy so far as defence was concerned. It was thought that by pursuing this policy Pakistan would be in a position to devote her own resources to the development of her human and material wealth and achieve greater economic stability and prosperity. But in spite of the military assistance provided by these pacts, Pakistan had to incur huge expenditure from her own budget for defence purposes, which obviously meant curtailment of expenditure to be applied on development plans. The result was that Pakistan had to look for economic aid, in the form of loans, exclusively from the Western bloc.

The policy of alignment was followed by each successive government of Pakistan from 1954 to 1965. Whatever be the criticism, it was, to a considerable extent, the compulsion of circumstances which led Pakistan to pursue this policy. However, in spite of being an aligned country, Pakistan always took an independent stand regarding such issues as Palestine, Suez Canal, self-determination of Indonesia, former Italian colonies in Africa, independence of Tunisia, Morocco, Algeria and other African colonies (which have since gained independence), human rights, race relations in South Africa and the representation of People's China at the United Nations.

As for development plans, Pakistan had to start from scratch as there had been virtually no industrial development. She was hampered by the absence of a large and skilled class of industrialists, managers and technicians. She also faced an acute shortage of foreign exchange. The economic assistance was indeed forthcoming from the West in the form of loans, but Pakistan was forced to entrust foreign exchange for the purpose of purchasing material and equipment, only to those few industrialists who had experience and who could prove their competence. This put her in the unfortunate position of encouraging and developing monopolies, and of placing immense wealth in the hands of ten, fifteen or twenty families. Undoubtedly attempts were made by a few Governments to bring some of the basic industries as well as public utilities under State control, but these experiments were not successful for the simple reason that structures of nationalisation cannot in themselves solve the problem of equal distribution of the means of living because

structures cannot guarantee that men will be found capable of doing in a competent way the difficult and creative jobs that industrialists in the private sector do for their own selfish ends.

Under the Ayub Regime (1958-69), land reforms were implemented. This step was not only justified by practical necessity, but was also in conformity with the ideals on which Pakistan had been founded. However, owing to political bribery and corruption, the countless masses of impoverished and landless tenants could not get much benefit from these reforms. The resumed lands were distributed as grants or sold mostly to the supporters of the Regime or other elements of a similar character.

During this period, through enormous loans drawn from the Western bloc, industry developed rapidly. But since the policy was to feed primarily the private sector, the wealth of a restricted number of families also increased rapidly. Most of these wealthy industrialists evaded taxation and increased their wealth by blackmarketing, hoarding, speculation and other illegal activities. With the increase of wealth in restricted hands, corruption also increased at all levels. Prices went shooting upwards, the Press was gagged, there existed no freedom of expression, no political activity and no fundamental rights. Corruption and political bribery became the rule of the day and the Regime was brazenfacedly celebrating the 'Decade of Progress' or remained content by providing pragmatic explanations for its 'temporary' shortcomings and failings which were described as 'inherited' handicaps.

Pakistan's foreign policy showed tendencies of change in 1962 when after the Sino-Indian conflict the United States gave military aid in large quantities to India. This shook the balance of power in South Asia. In consequence thereof Pakistan felt obliged to strengthen her ties with People's China. Then followed in September, 1965, the Indian attack on Pakistan coupled with the general feeling that the United States had betrayed Pakistan completely. These events made Pakistan realise, for the first time, that dependence on or alignment with a specific power bloc was dangerous, because each power bloc had its own policies to pursue and was likely to use a small country like Pakistan as a piece on the chess board of international competition for supremacy. As a result, from a policy of

Alignment, Pakistan shifted to a policy of Bilateralism. She did not break off her ties with the West, but concentrated more on the development of closer bilateral relations with People's China as well as the Soviet Union and other countries of the Socialist bloc.

The Ayub Regime eventually collapsed due to a country-wide political agitation. Undoubtedly this agitation had resulted from general economic discontent, though causes like political repression coupled with the emphasis on centralisation, had let loose such negative forces as Parochialism, Regionalism, and Provincialism throughout Pakistan. During the Ayub Regime Pakistan also passed through a phase of ideological decay and the principles on which this country had been founded were misinterpreted, twisted or distorted to suit the needs and requirements of the Regime.

However, before the general elections were held in December, 1970, the principle of adult franchise on the basis of 'one man one vote' was conceded and the one Unit of West Pakistan was broken up into former four provinces of the Punjab, North West Frontier, Sind and Baluchistan. Had the Ideology of Pakistan been a living force, these changes would have made no difference at all; on the contrary, they may have added more strength and vitality to it. But the Ideology was ignored during the general elections which were fought on no other basis than regional or class hatred, and, therefore, the result almost tore the country into pieces. Can these general elections be of any use or benefit to the Pakistani nation? Only the future will answer this question. However the experiment has, to a considerable extent, re-awakened the desire of reverting to the purity of the foundational principles.

There are four real threats to the national unity, territorial integrity and independence of Pakistan. One threat is internal whereas three are external. The internal threat is the development of Parochialism, Regionalism and Provincialism which in its turn engenders secessionist tendencies and these could lead to the disintegration or dissolution of Pakistan. The three external threats are: Indian aggression against Pakistan, economic dependence on the Western powers which enables them to interfere in the internal affairs of Pakistan, and the ideological invasion of Communism.

The interpretation of Marx's *dialectical materialism* is briefly as follows: that the process of history is a process of class war; that the end of the process would be achieved when the lowest class, i.e., the proletariat, seizes power and establishes the dictatorship of the proletariat; that when this occurs a classless society will emerge, the State will wither away, and everyone will live in peace, prosperity and happiness; that all religious and metaphysical ideas are merely ideological superstructures and methods of rationalisation of existing economic conditions; and that there is no transcendent Reality outside of Man, therefore, all idealism and religious beliefs are simply projections of Man's mind through which he justifies existing conditions. (Marx called religion 'pie in the sky'—a trick by which the rich made the poor accept their poverty in this world by telling them that they would be rewarded in the Hereafter).

The Communists, therefore, claim that they alone understand the process and the goal of history; theirs is the exclusive access to the truth and consequently all ideas other than theirs must be erased or eradicated from the human mind. This exclusive knowledge gives the Communists the right to absolute power, and frees them from all ethical and moral responsibility.

The emotional foundations of Communism are laid on *hatred* for all non-Communists because the latter are considered the enemies of the proletariat, or the tools and instruments of decadence, the people who oppose the development of the classless society and must, therefore, be either converted or liquidated. Thus the Communists inevitably become fanatical since they believe that anyone who disagrees with them is an enemy. ("He who is not for us, is against us.") They also believe that Capitalism, Democratic Socialism of every form and all the other political systems of the world are decadent and inevitably destined to deteriorate or be destroyed by the rising proletariat. Hence the Communists in each and every country owe allegiance only to the Communist Party and even if they are elected to a parliament where other parties are represented, their exclusive object is not to cooperate with any other party except for the purpose of destroying the existing political system.

What are the achievements of Communism when put into practice? In both the Soviet Union and People's China, the Communists have had immense success in terms of commanding absolute allegiance from their followers. They have been able to do this mainly because of their emphasis on an educational policy which is founded on the belief that only Communist theory should be taught, and that it should be drilled into the minds of the children as well as the adults. This device is very effective particularly in those countries where the background of the masses is illiteracy and gross class distinctions. (Marx was certain that Communism would succeed in Germany and Western Europe, but this did not happen because an educated and critical industrial class has always been opposed to accepting the inflexibility and rigidity of the Communist doctrines. They rather formed trade unions which gradually led to the development of Democratic Socialism in some of the Western countries.)

However, the effect of drilling Communist theory into the minds of the peasants and workers has been to release a flood of energy and activity. The people indoctrinated in this way have accepted willingly the orders to work extremely hard. Accordingly cities and factories have been built, sanitary measures have been enforced, and new methods of agriculture have been implemented. All the old lethargy and stubbornness of the peasants (against change) is eliminated both by compelling them to adopt new methods under threat of severe punishment and by educating them to believe that the new forms of activity would make them supremely happy and prosperous. As a result almost overnight literacy has been developed throughout the Communist countries, agriculture has been collectivised, and a vast programme of industrialisation has been implemented. The Communist Party lays down five-year plans and the people are forced to carry out unquestioningly whatever the plans demand.

The material achievements of Communism have been accomplished mainly because the Communist leaders have absolute power, are responsible to no one in heaven or earth for their actions (or so they think), and do not hesitate to use any form of force to accomplish their aims and objects.

In Russia thousands of peasants who resisted the collectivisation of agriculture were annihilated or sent to forced labour camps. These forced labour camps, which are full of political prisoners and deviationists of various kinds, have also been used as a method for accomplishing feats of building, mining etc.

Communism in practice means complete surrender of freedom of thought and action. Anyone who disagrees with the Communist doctrines (intellectually or otherwise) is either destroyed, exiled, or brain-washed. Brain-washing is a device adopted by the Communists through which a person is subjected to intensive indoctrination, questioning, and psychological pressure of various kinds until he agrees to accept as true whatever the Communists teach him.

The liberal university tradition has completely disappeared from the Communist countries because history, philosophy, *Dialectics* and *Objective Truth* are taught only in the light of Communist theory and no criticism is permitted. The Communists are, therefore, rearing a generation of people who are as ignorant of the thought and life of the outer world as if they were from another planet.

True brotherhood and co-operation are not possible under the existing Soviet system because everything is subordinated to production. In the Soviet Union the *Stakhanov* scheme provides rewards for those who produce most efficiently, and demands that each and every worker should produce at the same rate as the best. The appeal to personal egotism makes every worker the competing enemy of his fellow worker.

Under the Soviet system Man is loyal only to the totalitarian State, not to any person or any group. The State owns all property. Thus on collective farms the workers are really just tenants of the State, working for the State. They are not permitted to set up independent groups e.g., local self-governing bodies which would be free to develop along their own lines, but everything is subordinated to the plans from the Centre.

True brotherhood and co-operation are also non-existent because of the maintenance of the Secret Police system in the Soviet Union. Since the Communist theory is that each and every citizen

must believe and think exactly as the Communist Party dictates, the Communist leaders maintain a vigilant watch throughout every corner, every village, every city, every farm, every factory, and every home to ensure that all citizens are thinking as they should. This is accomplished by the enormous and elaborate Secret Police the effect of which is to create distrust everywhere because nobody knows who is a spy for the State. Hence everyone watches his words and is under the pressure of fear to try persistently to conform his mind to what he is expected to believe. Thinking the wrong thoughts might mean thinking the wrong thoughts *aloud*, which might lead to condemnation as an enemy of the people, and a sentence to a forced labour camp.

The Judicial system of the Communists is primitive because it assumes that a person is guilty if the Communist Party says he is guilty. The State guarantees no rights for the individual; in fact the individual is entirely at the mercy of the State.

One of the most grotesque features of Communist history has been the trials of former Communist leaders accused of wrong thinking and betrayal of the cause. In reality such trials only indicate that these leaders have lost in the struggle for power among the top Communists, but the triumph of the victorious leaders has to be celebrated at the kinds of trials which are a mockery of justice. Accordingly the vanquished leaders confess at length to their ideological crimes, accuse themselves, condemn themselves and affirm that it is a great honour to be corrected of error by the State which is always right and which cares with such tenderness for its people. Thus the State not only condemns arbitrarily and without reference to any authority outside its own will, desires, whims and caprices, but it also humiliates the individual by forcing him to condemn himself as a traitor. Consequently those who are condemned by the Communist Party almost always do publicly confess that they are traitors. The primitive nature of the Communist legal system is also manifested in the belief of the Communist Party that the people could and should accept the truth of such mock trials.

The political system which the Communists have evolved is also a mockery of the idea of democracy. Here, too, although they retain the external form, they empty it completely of all real meaning. It

is, therefore, a fictitious democracy, firstly, because the Council of the Supreme Soviet has almost absolute power, and it constantly watches the trends of thought and activities of the people through the Secret Police. Secondly, because of the practice of public nomination of candidates everyone knows in advance which persons the Communist Party wants to be elected; and thirdly, because of the absence of opposition parties under the Soviet system, for according to the Communist philosophy any and every person who disagrees on any point is a traitor, and the traitors are quickly found out. They are prompt in tendering confessions, are accordingly humiliated by public trials and punished. (In the early years of Stalin's rule almost all the Communist leaders who had preceded him were purged and condemned in this way).

There does not exist any real democracy within the factories and the collective farms because the managers are employed by the State to get as much work as possible out of the workers. The managers get bonuses from the State, if production increases, and they are authorised to lower the wages of the workers if they are dissatisfied with production. Thus the workers do not have even as much protection as they have under Capitalism or Democratic Socialism because they have nothing in the way of trade unions or local self-governing bodies with effective power to strike, protest against or criticise the policies of the State.

The managers and the civil servants are not secure and protected either because their thoughts and activities are constantly under the eyes of the Secret Police. They could, at any time, be condemned (for wrong thinking or failure to produce or work efficiently), humiliated or punished. Thus no individual and no group anywhere in the State is able to protect itself against the arbitrary will of the few Communist leaders at the top. These few leaders have a degree of absolute power unprecedented in the history of mankind.

What is the effect of Communism on the rest of the world? The effect of the Russian and Chinese revolutions on the rest of the world has been dazzling, confusing and terrifying. The world has been dazzled by the material success of the Communists in industrialising vast areas in a few decades and by the unprecedented overnight transition of millions of people from a mediaeval illiterate peasant

stage of development to the status of literate and skilled industrial workers.

Since the fascination of Communism lies in its promise of the immediate transformation of the whole of society, it appeals to all those who are oppressed and frustrated by class, racial and religious hostilities and antagonisms, unemployment, insecurity, illiteracy and social inferiority. It also speaks to those intellectuals who feel frustrated by the emptiness and lack of sense of purpose in life and offers them the vision of working selflessly for the common good. Communism dazzles because its talk is focused on the future—it promises a radiant and perfect future in this world for everyone and promises that all this can be achieved quickly and easily by the surrender of one's will and mind to the dictates of the Communist Party.

"One cannot understand the Communists", observes Helmut Gollwitzer, "until one has grasped the fact that since the times of Marx they have all been fascinated by the picture of what man might be in the future.... (In their view) we are now only at the beginning of the history of man and the real man is only now standing before us. His era will begin when Communism triumphs over the class-ridden society.... History up till now has been nothing but a laborious struggle of man to find his way out of the primeval forest; religions, racial hatred, wars—all these are the dead wood of the primeval forest. The man of the future will be able to dominate completely the laws of nature, a transparently rational being with a will ruled entirely by reason and freed from everything that was stupid, irrational and sub-human. Gorki once said that Lenin was the only man alive then who lived entirely in the future, the land of the future lay before his eyes as though it was in the present, as faultlessly fashioned as crystal."[3]

This fascination with the future has the double effect of blinding the Communists to the realities of both the present and the past. Being blind to the present allows them to ignore shortcomings in their own system and permits them to continue to believe that Capitalism must be destroying itself (because Marx said it would), that workers in the West are starving, are bitterly exploited and miserable, and that socialist governments (like the Welfare State in England) have done nothing for the workers. Although the Communists

claim that Marxism is a science, they are actually the least scientific of men in many ways. They begin by passionate belief in the Communist theory and refuse to accept any evidence which might disprove any small portion of their theory. Blind fanaticism of this kind always leads to the shattering of moral and ethical values. Accordingly the Communists feel entirely justified in exploiting racial hatreds, in attempting to break up democratic governments, in sabotage, in any kind of destructive activity against non-Communist political systems. The Communists are permanently at war with the rest of the world, and believe that in war everything is permitted against the enemy.

They are also blind to the past since they believe that everything in the past was primitive and sub-human. This is the reason why in their schools and Universities the Communists have no concern to teach about the literature, history, philosophy and religion of the past except in terms of their theory. Religion for them is simply an outdated curiosity—a peculiar habit of ignorant and primitive Man. The Communist Man—modern, scientific, rational, radiant, sees things *dialectically* and believes only in *Objective Truth.* He has nothing to do with such primitive and superstitious ideas as God, Moral Law and Divine Judgement on the affairs of mankind.

The Communists have confused the world because of the contradiction between their promise to offer a perfect, just, classless and stateless society—and the reality of their practice in terms of absolute state power, purges, brain-washing, injustice and oppression.

Communism is dangerous because it engenders blind fanaticism and hatred, and denies the right of existence to any and everybody who does not accept the Communist creed. It is completely devoid of intellectual humility and tolerance. It rejects the idea that love and freedom are impossible in a State which is founded on fanatical adherence to a theory (that is enforced by Secret Police and purges). Communism is also dangerous because of the force and violence of its propaganda which is constantly pouring in streams all over the world. The propaganda machines of the Communists ceaselessly condemn capitalists, imperialists, colonialists and all the oppressors of the poor. They promise immediate relief and a brave new world to all those who will surrender to the Communist Party and give

their lives to its purposes. The more illiterate, poor, hungry, oppressed, frustrated, confused and ignorant a people are, the more prepared they are to be seduced by the soft words and bright promises of the Communist propaganda.

Communism appeals particularly in areas like Asia (Africa and Latin America) which have recently thrown off the yoke of Western Imperialism and Colonialism (or which are in the process of doing so) and have gained their liberty and independence. It appeals in such areas because the contrast between the illiteracy and gross class distinctions, hunger, poverty, disease and terrible conditions of work or unemployment, and the availability of a new life in an industrialised society seems so overwhelming. It teaches that the cause of all their misfortunes is simply adherence to wrong ideas (religion, caste, feudalism etc.) and that the new life is available immediately by accepting the new creed of Communism, by having a revolution, and by obeying faithfully the dictates of the Communist Party. In Asia this appeal is particularly strong because Asians can see that in China the previously illiterate and oppressed peasants have destroyed their old masters and achieved a new and seemingly better form of life.

Communism is a new form of Imperialism, intent on the acquisition of territory and power. It is, at the same time, a powerful and deadly germ ready to infect the body in a moment at any place where there is a weakness.

Islam in Pakistan would be a weak spot if it is allowed to remain in the form of a religion which fits the Communist description of 'pie in the sky', i.e., if it teaches fatalism, keeps the poor oppressed, justifies social inequality, or rejects the idea of transforming conditions in the material world so that immediate equality, happiness, prosperity and justice for all may be attained.

The Communists maintain that religion is a tool by which the rich blind the eyes of the poor, and it is unfortunately correct to some extent, for in practice religion almost always has tended to be on the side of Conservatism and reactionary forces, and against social change.

The Communists also preach that religion is based essentially on primitive and barbaric superstitions. The existence of superstitious practices (worship of the tombs of the Saints, the institution

of *Pirs* etc.) therefore, may easily lead a people who are gradually becoming modernised to believe that the Communist idea of religion is true.

The Communists also emphasise that the exclusion of women from the freedom to work, to make their own lives, and to enjoy equality in society with men is a feature of the mediaeval form of society which precedes the Communist revolution. But the Communist revolution, they say, will provide all the freedom and the opportunities which have been denied to women for centuries, and would remove at one blow all the old prejudices, and all the old traditions of seclusion, and allow women full freedom to develop their personalities in any direction they choose for themselves. In China where women were restricted by the social barriers of a mediaeval form of society, overnight they have been released by the revolution and given equal status and rights with men to avail themselves of the opportunities which the country has to offer. Chinese women have worked tremendously hard and have helped very much in accomplishing the transformation of their society.

Our weaknesses which the Communists could exploit are numerous, e.g., illiteracy, poverty, hunger, malnutrition, disease, unsanitary conditions, unemployment, insecurity, corruption, discrimination, inadequate educational facilities, bad hospitals, meagre wages and oppressive working conditions for peasants, industrial workers and labourers.

Further, the existence of tribal, racial, regional, provincial and sectarian jealousies, and prejudice against certain forms of labour (barbers, *dhobies*, sweepers etc.) also provides an ideal situation for the Communists to exploit. Anyone frustrated by the feeling that his profession or occupation or faith makes him a social outcast is readily susceptible to the promise of a revolution which will give him dignity and a status of equality with the more privileged others. Communism promises an immediate release to people maddened by the petty prejudices, taboos and rigidities of a mediaeval form of social and cultural life, and shows them the prospect of a new world where everyone is equal and free from humiliation.

How then should the State in Pakistan influence the minds of the people and direct their transition from mediaeval to modern ways of

thinking so that Pakistan might be safeguarded against the ideological offensive of Communism as well as the other threats which confront her?

Major Responsibility of the Centre

In order to suppress the growth of Parochialism, Regionalism and Provincialism, a constitution may be framed which grants maximum autonomy to the units constituting the federation of Pakistan. But no federal constitution can function unless and until the Centre has adequate powers. Whatever may be these adequate powers, the major responsibility of the Centre is to retain all matters pertaining to the Ideology of Pakistan, Education and Information as Central subjects. This is essential for the maintenance of national unity and territorial integrity of Pakistan.

Educational Policy based on Islamic Principles

The only way to free the people quickly from the fetters of mediaeval fatalism and superstition is to undertake an intensive educational programme of impressing the Ideology of Pakistan on the minds of the people, particularly in the rural areas. And in this respect we have no time to waste, but we must act and act quickly.

The Islamic principles of *equality*, *solidarity* and *freedom* must be drilled into the minds of the people as soon as possible by the use of all the modern techniques of mass education, Radio, Press etc. These principles must be articulated clearly and taught in the context of modern life so that our people may understand why Islam offers a much better way of life than any other.

Our educational policy should be assimilative, allowing the expression and justifying the existence of regional cultures and traditions, yet focusing its attention on a definite object, i.e., the dissemination of Islamic Ideology.

Youth leagues and volunteer corps (male as well as female) should be organised on an All-Pakistan basis. To these bodies should be deputed the task of social service, reform of customs, commercial organisation and economic uplift of the rural areas.

These organisations should promote the growth of *Muslim Nationalism* among the people by reminding them through a series of lectures etc. of the past achievements of Islam and what Islam has still to accomplish in the moral, cultural and social development of humanity.

A new spirit should be infused in our peasants through the implementation of land reforms, and popularisation of new methods of agriculture, and schemes of mass education so that they might work very hard in order to achieve prosperity and happiness. They should also be made to reject all tribal, racial, provincial and sectarian jealousies and prejudices against certain so-called menial forms of labour. They should be taught that God has commanded all Muslims to respect and honour the dignity and equality of all men.

Introduction of Local Self-governing Bodies and Trade Unions

Local self-governing bodies and trade unions should be introduced so that our peasants and workers could organise themselves and develop their capacity for constructive criticism of the Government. They should be allowed to discuss their problems, suggest improvements or modifications of the schemes of agriculture or industrialisation which the State desires to implement. In this way they should be encouraged to have a say in the governing of the country as well as to protect their rights.

Introduction of the Principle of National Service

Our university students (male as well as female) must not be permitted to get their Degrees or Diplomas unless and until they have had training in physical education and courage, and they have learnt that manual labour is a dignified form of service. They should be utilised in doing various forms of social or national service such as nursing, teaching adults as well as children in the villages, building houses, wells and roads, electrifying villages, working in the fields, assisting in the programmes of medical relief and other development programmes, and generally demonstrating to the peasants and workers, their feeling of *equality* and *solidarity* with them, their dedication and their willingness to work.

It would also be advisable to use the army in this connection because they have the facilities at their disposal to complete such feats of construction in no time. If this were done, it would help to create a feeling of *equality* and *solidarity* among our people and would show them that our army is an *army of peace*. Such a practical expression of *equality* and *solidarity* is the best way to overcome the present apathy, social arrogance, corruption and general uselessness of our educated youth.

Reform in the Civil and Military Services' Academies, and Police Officers' Training Centres

Our Civil and Military Services' Academies and Police Officers' Training Centres have been organised on the British lines. In these institutions the future administrators, army and police officers of our country are given training in their respective fields, but at the same time, they are instructed (in accordance with the British Colonial services' principles) to remain detached and aloof from the common people. These future officers might be given some idea of Islam as a culture (as for instance, in the case of the trainees at the Civil Service Academies) but the object behind it is (again in accordance with the British Colonial services' principles) simply to train and to equip them to understand better the mental make-up of the common people.

It is very necessary to accomplish a reform in these institutions. The Ideology of Islam should be drilled into the minds of the future officers. They must not only learn table manners, etiquette, riding etc. (the object of this kind of training is only to detach these officers from the common people by inculcating in them a sense of social superiority and arrogance) but should learn to serve the common people. Furthermore, they must not only be taught to believe in *service* as an ideal, but should be instructed to demonstrate it by actually working with and assisting the common people. It is essential that our future officers should demonstrate to the common people their feeling of *equality* and *solidarity* with them, their dedication and their willingness to work.

Reform in the Corrective Centres, Jails and other Preventive Detention Institutions

In these institutions also it is necessary to introduce a reform. The inmates of these institutions must be given an intensive indoc-

trination in the Islamic Ideology and they must be provided with facilities of such instruction and training that they might attain the status of literate, self-respecting and skilled industrial workers.

Provision for Medical Relief

The State must provide for medical relief on a national basis, and the people must organise all their energy and wealth to fight disease, unsanitary conditions and malnutrition. The people must be taught their responsibility to give selflessly of their time and energy to overcome these problems. The personnel and facilities of the army could also be used to help organise and administer programmes of public health, disease prevention and medical relief.

Organisation of Press, Radio, Television etc.

The public information services of the State should of course be used to propagate in an efficient and thorough-going manner the Islamic principles of *equality*, *solidarity* and *freedom*. At the same time these services should aim to build up public opinion which scorns the lazy, the arrogant, the cowardly and the corrupt, and which admires and extols the hard-working, the industrious, the selfless and the austere.

Arts in the Service of the Community

It has already been suggested that the authors connected with the Aligarh movement *plus* Iqbal provide the cultural background of the Ideology of Pakistan. Poets and writers like Hali, Shibli, Iqbal and others were concerned to use their talents to inspire the Muslims with vision and courage to accept the challenges of modern life. Pakistan very much needs many more such poets and writers who can promote love, unity and understanding among our people and annihilate all sectarian and provincial antagonisms from our midst. Our poets and writers should try to select such themes as can help the people learn to overcome some of their mediaeval habits and narrow-minded attitudes and as will encourage them to look towards the future in all aspects of their collective life. Part of their responsibility should be to select those themes that will help to keep before the eyes of the Government the real needs and problems of the people. They should

do all they can to help Pakistan become strong, prosperous and just. The State should do all it can to encourage such poets and writers.

In Pakistan it has frequently been asked: What is Islamic culture? When this question is raised it usually means: What is the connection between Islam and the fine arts? The function of great art has always been to awaken sensitivity, compassion, tolerance, courage, power, hope, joy and understanding of the complexity and depth of truly human life. In the opinion of Iqbal, the fine arts (e.g., painting, music and even poetry) which could transform Man and make him realise his felicitous function as the Deputy (*Khalifah*) of God on Earth are yet to be born in Islam. Islamic architecture, however, he regards as the only exception.

For determining the value of the fine arts in our collective life, the question raised should be: What kind of culture conforms to and expresses the Ideology on which Pakistan is founded? To answer this we may first ask: What kind of fine arts have we had so far in Pakistan? In the case of painting, for example, we can see that generally speaking there are two main traditions influencing our artists. The first is our own classical *Mughal* style. This kind of art represents a form of escapism. Its manner may be graceful and refined, but it is essentially effeminate and lacking in any real vitality and power. It does not pretend to move us deeply nor to communicate any serious message about life; it seems a fairy cobweb of flimsy lines which a puff of breath could dissipate.

Secondly, we have the influence of contemporary Western art, which is, generally speaking, the product of the hopelessness, confusion, defeatism and lack of faith through which the West is passing. Of course all Western art is not of this kind; the great aritsts of the Renaissance and Reformation such as Michelangelo and Rembrandt produced art with great spiritual force capable of instilling in men faith, power, hope and courage, Unfortunately we have generally preferred to be influenced by the more sordid and defeatist forms of Western art rather than by the works of the men who passionately believed in God and expressed their faith with unequalled power, vision and sensitivity.

We need to liberate our art from bondage of all these effeminate, defeatist and deadening influences, and let it burst forth as a powerful

affirmation of our faith in ourselves and in our future. We need a virile, generous, expansive and strong art which can rouse our people to action, and transform their narrow and distrustful attitudes into a broad tolerance and a passion for righteousness. We need paintings which can communicate to us the same sense of simplicity, magnificence, purity, dignity and power which we experience when we look at the great masterpieces of Islamic architecture. The State should encourage painters whose work will give our people a message of faith, hope and courage. It should also, of course, encourage the development of music and other modes of art which could help in the same way to express our Ideology.

In modern progressive countries (particularly the Soviet Union and People's China) the films and the theatre are used to communicate new ideas and methods to the masses of the people. Drama has always been one of the most effective modes of touching people's hearts and inspiring in them new insights into the meanings and possibilities of life. Syed Ahmad Khan also recognised the significance and importance of the theatre and himself once appeared on the stage at Aligarh for the purpose of collecting money for his College. We should use the stage and the films to help disseminate the Ideology on which Pakistan is founded and to show our people in vivid pictorial form what the future can be if they will respond creatively to the challenges of modern life. The State should, therefore, encourage the development of the theatre and the use of films for these ends.

Establishment of the Institute of Science

What is it that gives such material strength to the great powers which are presently dominating the world scene? It is obviously their use of science and scientific method for the material advancement of their peoples.

The modern Muslim revivalists realised fully that the survival of the Muslim Community depended on the acquisition of the new sciences. Syed Ahmad Khan even ventured to translate into Urdu the Western scientific works for the purposes of encouraging research in this field. He, accordingly, founded a Scientific Society (in 1863) which undertook the task of translating standard European scientific

literature into Urdu. He, at the same time, started the publication of a weekly called *the Aligarh Institute Gazette* (1866-1898) which laid emphasis on the acquisition of modern sciences.

Exhorting the Muslims to grasp the secret of Western power, Jamaluḍdin Afghani also stressed the acquisition of the techniques of European progress, which really depended on the advancement of modern sciences.

Iqbal was concerned to prove that the spirit of Islam is not only favourable to the development of science, but that the basic attitude of the Quran is scientific in the sense that in connection with Man's mastery over matter it attaches great importance to the knowledge derived through sense perception. In other words, Iqbal holds that the very spirit of the Quran is empirical.

Iqbal quotes from Briffault's *Making of Humanity* to show that the Muslims were the originators of the experimental method and that in the Middle Ages their experimental method was widespread and eagerly cultivated throughout Europe.

Briffault observes: "Science is the most momentous contribution of Arab civilisation to the modern world; but its fruits were slow in ripening. Not until long after Moorish culture had sunk back into darkness did the giant which it had given birth rise in his might. It was not science only which brought Europe back to life. Other and manifold influences from the civilisation of Islam communicated its first glow to European life....For although there is not a single aspect of European growth in which the decisive influence of Islamic culture is not traceable, nowhere is it so clear and momentous as in the genesis of that power which constitutes the permanent distinctive force of the modern world, and the supreme source of its victory—natural science and the scientific spirit.... The debt of our science to that of the Arabs does not consist in startling discoveries of revolutionary theories; science owes a great deal more to Arab culture, it owes its existence. The ancient world was, as we saw, pre-scientific. The Astronomy and Mathematics of the Greeks were a foreign importation never thoroughly acclimatised in Greek culture. The Greeks systematised, generalised, and theorised, but the patient ways of investigation, the accumulation of positive knowledge, the

minute methods of science, detailed and prolonged observation and experimental inquiry were altogether alien to the Greek temperament. Only in Hellenistic Alexandria was any approach to scientific work conducted in the ancient classical world. What we call science arose in Europe as a result of a new spirit of inquiry, of new methods of investigation, of the method of experiment, observation, measurement, of the development of Mathematics in a form unknown to the Greeks. That spirit and those methods were introduced into the European world by the Arabs."

Now, however, we live in an age when the techniques and skills of scientific experimentation and research have been highly organised and developed. New discoveries and inventions are continuously being made. The nation which is farthest ahead in the field of science and technology is inevitably going to be the master of the earth. New discoveries have given Man unprecedented power both to destroy and to create. Our only choice is either to compete and try to achieve an equal level of scientific development with other nations or to become their helpless dependents.

It is, therefore, suggested that the scientific talent of Pakistan should be organised under an Institute of Science which should have all the necessary equipment and facilities for doing research. We should try to investigate possibilities of using atomic power for peaceful purposes. The State should do all it can to ensure that our younger generation is given guidance and help in experimental research by the best scientists who can be procured for this purpose.

Agricultural Policy

God has emphasised in the Quran that those individual Muslims who 'have' must give away their 'surplus' to the support and welfare of the 'have-nots' (2; verse 219). The ideas of Islamic equality, solidarity and freedom can only be realised in a social and economic structure in which all the members of the Community share as equally as possible in the prosperity of the country. In a situation where most of the land is owned by a few rich families whose vast properties enable them to wield immense political power and influence, and where there are countless masses of impoverished and landless tenants, the resulting inequality would clearly be contrary

to the spirit of Islam. Therefore, there is no reason why further land reforms are not enforced in this country. It is suggested that the limit of land-holdings should be fixed in accordance with the principle laid down by Iqbal i.e., the extent of land which can be brought under self-cultivation by an individual landowner. Similarly, the collection of *batai* or rent from land should be forbidden so that land remains only in possession of such landowners who can self-cultivate it. The State must sell half of the resumed land in instalments to the landless tenants. Agricultural Income Tax should be levied and land revenue should be remitted in the case of petty landowners. In order to increase production, co-operative farming on modern lines or a form of commune system which is in conformity with our Ideology should be imposed. The growth of agricultural industries such as sheep farming, poultry farming, repair of tractors and agricultural appliances etc. as well as research must be encouraged and the attention of the students belonging to rural areas should be diverted to this direction rather than pursuing fruitless art studies in city colleges.

Industrial Policy

It has already been stated that from the standpoint of Islam, the State is responsible for maintaining a fair distribution of wealth among all its citizens. We should, therefore, prevent the concentration and accumulation of wealth and means of production and distribution in the hands of the few to the detriment of the interest of the many. But the structures of nationalisation in themselves cannot solve this problem because it cannot be guaranteed that competent, efficient and selfless men will be found to accomplish the objective. We can only implement the Islamic ideals of a just distribution and use of wealth if we can produce men who can do well the work of setting up and running industries, and who are ready to work for the Community rather than themselves.

Experienced business people usually do not believe that men ever would work so hard for the Community as they would do for themselves. This belief is really a denial of the kind of society God has promised in the Quran. We can only answer their disbelief by developing an educational system which will produce capable men who will prove by their hard, dedicated and fruitful work that God's promises are not an illusion.

We must keep in mind while planning our economy that we should always aim at developing a form of society in which the wealth of the country may be used in the most constructive way for the benefit of everybody. Keeping this end in view, we should then proceed to take each step in terms of the needs, requirements and opportunities of the moment. Islam forbids the taking of interest on money loaned as well as speculation. For the realisation of this objective, banks and insurance companies can be nationalised. Similarly, the number of basic industries and public utilities which are at present under State control, can be increased.

In order to solve our economic and defence problems, the emphasis must be on the acquisition of technology and this can only be achieved by the immediate installation of Iron and Steel manufacturing industries and Heavy Engineering complexes under State control. Such a step would gradually lead to our independence from foreign aid and self-sufficiency. We have the example of the Japanese and Chinese nations before us. These nations managed to achieve self-sufficiency by attaining independence from foreign aid; and today, in the field of technology, they are counted among the progressive nations of the world. We must realise that only those nations can survive and progress in the modern world which are creative or inventive in the field of technology. God says in the Quran: "We sent our messengers with clear proofs, and revealed with them the Book and the Balance, that mankind may observe right measure; and was revealed Iron, wherein is mighty power and many benefits for mankind." (57; verse 25). It may be noted that the Quran has mentioned the Book, the Balance, and Iron together in this verse. Therefore, it is clear that the social justice (the Balance) of which the Quran (the Book) speaks has a special connection with Iron. Obviously, it is self-sufficiency through which the ideal of social justice can be really achieved, and self-sufficiency or self-reliance in the modern world can only be realised through the installation and development of Iron and Steel industries.

The industrial policy which we have been so far pursuing has led to the establishment of monopolies, and this is perhaps unavoidable under existing conditions. Our next step, however, should be to decentralise industry and to encourage its growth all over Pakistan, especially in those areas where raw materials are available

(e.g., for the establishment of wood and allied industries—Jhelum). In areas such as Peshawar and Sahiwal where the fruit industry has developed, allied industries like canning, printing of labels etc. should be promoted. At the same time, small industrialists should be provided with power facilities (gas, fuel, electricity etc.) and encouraged so that from the healthy competition among them the quality of goods may be improved.

The State should provide facilities for technical training, particularly in the industrial areas and should encourage students after matriculation to take up this form of training rather than studying arts etc. The decentralisation of industry in this way and the growth of factories and technical schools in the raw material producing areas should automatically lead to the raising of the standard of living and should bring prosperity in many different parts of Pakistan. We must always bear in mind that in the future when the country has been successfully and thoroughly industrialised, the industrial workers who are the real producers of wealth should themselves be provided with share in, control over, and responsibility for the industrial life of the country. It is very necessary that our economists and those who make the economic policies of our Government should have a clear understanding of the ideals which we are struggling to realise in Pakistan.

Social Democracy in Conformity with Ideology

It may be argued that one way to safeguard Pakistan against the ideological invasion of Communism is to adopt the Communist economic theory and practice and to retain Islam purely as a passive religious or spiritual element in our national life. The danger in this proposition is that on the happening of such an eventuality Pakistan shall become entirely dependent on and part and parcel of the Socialist bloc, and being a small power, would, at the most, acquire the status of a satellite (like Hungary, Poland or Czechoslovakia) of the Soviet Union and never that of an ally (like People's China). She is bound to lose her political independence in the bargain and her young men may feel obliged to resort to self-immolation in the same manner as the Czechoslovak youth, for the ideal of liberty which shall never be realisable. As a people, we have

sacrificed so much for attaining political independence from the British and Hindus. Even now we are struggling to get economic independence from the Western Powers so that they do not interfere in our internal affairs.

The most essential measure to safeguard Pakistan against the ideological invasion of Communism and the interference of the West in her internal affairs is to develop a form of social democracy which is in accordance with the principles of Islam. It should remove illiteracy, and provide free and compulsory education for all. It should provide for all facilities for just and humane conditions of work, and an adequate livelihood. It should provide the basic necessities of life, such as food, clothing, housing, education, medical relief and employment for everybody. It should prevent concentration of wealth and means of production and distribution in the hands of the few to the detriment of the interest of the many. It must aim at becoming a *Welfare State* of the Middle Class. It must do away with obvious manifestations of gross social inequality. The rich must be taxed until no rich people exist any longer.

Our leaders should live as simply and as austerely as possible, and should inculcate into the minds of the people the idea that ostentatious living in the midst of poverty is a betrayal of the principles of Islam, a form of idolatry, and an insult to the God of Islam. They should set the example of selfless and devoted hard work for the love, service and betterment of the people.

A nation like an individual passes through six stages of development which are birth, infancy, adolescence, maturity, old age and death. If a nation has attained old age (like old China) but has not died (like ancient Rome), then it might be rejuvenated and the cycle might be repeated. The examples of infant nations are Pakistan, India, Ceylon, Indonesia etc. Such nations usually concentrate on themselves and try to develop and exploit their means fully. They require for their development complete peace because they live under constant fear and danger of being grabbed by adolescent powers. The adolescent powers having become strong internally often look greedily towards others and are always a threat to world peace (e.g., Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy). They usually have dictatorships, and manage to acquire territory and power. The exam-

ples of mature nations may be England, France and other colonial powers. Such nations having attained maturity feel more inclined to give up and yield their territorial possessions and dominions to self-determination and independence.

It is clear from the above that Pakistan is yet in her infancy and, therefore, must concentrate entirely upon constructing herself. She must have friendly relations with her neighbours and work for peace because it is essential for her development. Furthermore, she must be vigilant and alert in order to see which are the adolescent nations around her who might threaten to swallow her up. Sometimes nations in the state of infancy develop adolescent or rather delinquent tendencies. Therefore, it is essential for Pakistan to build up her defence.

Defence

Following a policy of peace and friendship with each and every nation of the world does by no means imply that Pakistan should not strengthen her defences against foreign aggression. Indeed the bulk of our Budget is spent on defence instead of national reconstruction, but it seems necessary to make this sacrifice at this stage of our development. It is obvious that we cannot secure peace between Pakistan and India so long as the Kashmir and other disputes are not resolved. Hence the threat of Indian aggression will remain and we shall have to continue to incur huge expenditure from our Budget on the defence.

Maintenance of Friendly Relations with India

It has already been pointed out that Pakistan is not based on the philosophy of hatred for anybody. Therefore, it should be against our policy to inculcate among our people hatred for India. We must make India realise that a war between the two countries would neither benefit India nor Pakistan but would eventually destroy both of them. The history of the sub-continent teaches us that internecine wars in South Asia always invited aggression from outside which resulted in the conquest and subjugation of these territories. Therefore, Pakistan must at all costs avoid going to war against

India. The real object behind the Partition was, as has already been stated, to emancipate Islam politically and culturally, and not to sow seeds of discord between Islam and Hinduism. Now since that independence has been achieved there is no reason why the disputes should not be resolved peacefully, and there should not be harmony between Pakistan and India.

Working for a Unification of the Muslim World

It is also part of our Ideology to work for the unification of the Muslim world. Such a unification is not only an article of faith with us but is also essential for our defence. We have already formed alliances with Iran and Turkey, but we must try our best to win the friendship of Afghanistan and the Arab world.

We should always attempt to avoid the division of the world of Islam into Arabs and non-Arabs (Ajam). The history of Islam shows that such a division in the Muslim world has been generally very harmful to Islam.

From Alignment to Bilateralism

Pakistan, as a young country, cannot afford to follow a policy of isolation or neutralism. We have already advanced from the policy of Alignment to the policy of Bilateralism.

If the three power blocs of the present world, i.e., the United States, the Soviet Union, and People's China, were considered geometrically as three circles intersecting one another, then Pakistan must always avoid entering into the area where all the three circles cut one another. The area where the two out of three circles intersect each other, should be entered, if at all, with great caution. But where the three circles do not intersect at all, it is a field wide enough for Pakistan to work for and to develop closer ties bilaterally. Hence Pakistan should endeavour to remain closely linked on a bilateral basis with the United States, People's China and the Soviet Union.

Adherence to the United Nations Charter

Since Pakistan follows the Islamic ideal of peace towards the entire world and is already a member of the United Nations, she

should continue to uphold and support the United Nations Charter and should be willing to submit all her territorial and other disputes with India to arbitration.

Self-Reliance or Self-Sufficiency

Our desire is to achieve self-reliance or self-sufficiency, and our internal and external policies must be motivated and so oriented that this object is realised within the shortest span of time. This is possible only if we are disciplined and dedicated to the Ideology, are patient, cool-headed, determined, and rational in our approach to our numerous problems. But any deviation from the Ideology or any spasmodic, convulsionary and emotional frenzy, brought about through the dissemination of regional, provincial, sectarian or class hatred, is bound to result in an explosion which will be mutually destructive.

It has been made abundantly clear that spiritual values should form the basis of all social, political and economic activity in Pakistan. History shows that only those people who truly acknowledge the reality of God as *Creator* and *Judge* of the world can have a proper conception of the dignity, equality and freedom of Man. Therefore, it is only religion that can save the modern world from moral corruption and exploitation, class, racial and ideological hatred, greed for wealth and lust for power, and offer practicable principles on which a new and better world can be constructed and ordered.

"Both nationalism and atheistic socialism", says Iqbal, "at least in the present state of human adjustments, must draw upon the psychological forces of hate, suspicion, and resentment which tend to impoverish the soul of Man and close up the hidden sources of spiritual energy. Neither the technique of mediaeval mysticism nor nationalism nor atheistic socialism can cure the ills of a despairing humanity. Surely the present moment is one of great crisis in the history of modern culture. The modern world stands in need of biological renewal. And religion, which in its higher manifestations is neither dogma, nor priesthood, nor ritual, can alone ethically prepare the modern Man for the burden of the great responsibility which the advancement of modern science necessarily involves, and

restore to him that attitude of faith which makes him capable of winning a personality here and retaining it hereafter. It is only by rising to a fresh vision of his origin and future, his whence and whither, that Man will eventually triumph over a society motivated by an inhuman competition, and a civilisation which has lost its spiritual unity by its inner conflict of religious and political values".[4]

EPILOGUE

[It is the first time in the history of modern Islam that definite and practical solutions have been presented in this book concerning the role of Islam in the context of modern needs and requirements and altered conditions of life of Muslims. The first edition of the book provoked favourable as well as critical response from eminent national and international Islamicists, orientalists, thinkers, educationists and political leaders. It has been thought desirable to include in this book a few of these opinions and comments in order to encourage further thought and discussion on these issues so that the Ideology of Pakistan is no longer regarded as an abstract, vague, indefinite and theoretical ideal.]

Reuben Levy—(January 20, 1960)

I have examined your book with considerable interest. It is obviously full of the highest ideals and does credit to your loyalty to your father and his very practical views of what a Muslim State might be. I am not a politician, nor in any way capable of laying out a plan for a constitution, but it seems to me that you are in a hurry. You must begin by training up a small body of men of character and ideals, who will be the leaven to rouse the desired ferment among your youth. The boys and girls will in their turn become centres of enthusiasm until finally, after a couple of generations, you have achieved what you require. In that scheme you should not be too greatly bound by tradition and history—you yourself hint at that in your book—but must remember that you live in a modern world, which hates poverty and wants its share of the good things of life *here and now*. Not being an economist I can offer no advice on how a modern state can reach self-sufficiency, but I am sure no state does, in fact. We all live in taking in each other's washing. I have a feeling, however, that capitalist principles enter in, especially with a people hostile to *ibahah* (sharing)—Communism. You know the Persian proverb, that if you wish your *Kebab* to be properly cooked you must allow the fire to have a little of the fat, do not allow exorbi-

tant usury but give people an inducement to dig up their hoards and invest in government stocks and it may be that good-will would come of it. But first and foremost, you must educate your boys and girls in what is required of civilised people if they want to live together in a happy community. That sounds like preaching, but forgive me if I say it is only common sense.

A.J. Arberry—(January 28, 1960)

I have read your book with much interest and enjoyment. It is a very clear and cogent exposition, and I congratulate you upon your first book. I was delighted to see the many quotations which you have introduced from your father's writings.

Louis Massignon—(April 10, 1960)

I was eager to read and have just finished reading the book of a dear friend, son of a very honoured friend on coming back from a long cultural mission in the Near East (meeting of the Dictionary of the Arab Academy in Cairo, as annually etc.) It is comforting to feel that you are trying to complete the unfinished work of your dear father and my very honoured friend in making concrete suggestions and disclosing means by which depressed and oppressed people could rediscover themselves spiritually and materially. This is the need of the hour everywhere (De Gaulle does not realise it) and errors here and there in judging traditional thought lose importance where there is sincere, honest and youthful determination to achieve the goal. It is saintly to fight against cruelty and oppression in thought and action. But I am a very wretched kind of "saint"! The other day, when, having my right leg in difficulty (a nevrite), I still made my way out to preside a meeting against South African cruelties. My family did not lift up a finger to help me, saying I was interfering with foreign policy. I wrote in the "Monde" of March 27th a letter against the tortures which my poor friend the King of Morocco somehow tolerated, and he sent me a minister to reproach my friendship. Getting nearer and nearer to Death, I hold on to the poorest means for the defence of Truth, poor, disarmed, naked Truth of the shivering depressed and oppressed people, kneeling before them, burning for them the incense of my penitent "loveless" and "lovetorn" heart. To them all glory and praise for ever!

A. Bausani—(January 20, 1960)

I have read your book "The Ideology of Pakistan" with great interest. The problems raised by your stimulating work could be divided in two sorts: those referring to the best way of implementing the "Ideology of Pakistan" i.e. Islam in relation to Pakistan, and those regarding Islam in a general and more abstract way. (For instance, how can the school be organised on a sound and true Islamic basis concerns practically only you Pakistanis; what is the essence of Islam can concern us, too, in general).

My personal and rather heretic opinion is that, as long as the *Shari'at* is considered a strictly speaking *essential* part of Islam, and as long as no clear source of "authority" is defined for any change or adaptation of the same (*Shari'at*), modern Islam will find itself in a continuous dilemma. For instance, the *Hadd* punishment of cutting the hand of a thief is clearly a *Qur'anic* and *shari'* law, but practically everybody thinks it is now superseded by the evolution of mankind (though it was very practical and right at the times of the ancient Arabs). Is that law (of cutting the hand of a thief) an essential part of Islam? Many modern Islamic thinkers answer: No. But so I can always ask them: Who can say so? Only God. I agree with it, because only God is the source of all authority. But through whom or through which organisation or political or religious body *does God speak now*? This is a problem I always felt very deeply (as in older times Nasir-i-Khusrav, who delineates it in his very beautiful autobiographic *qasida*) a problem which brought me to my religious researches and to abandon even the typical Christian idea: "Back to primitive and pure Christianity!" A careful study of the conditions of primitive Christianity brought me to the conclusion that primitive Christian beliefs were.... primitive and not suitable for modern mankind.

This problem (which of course is not at all felt as such by the irreligious people) is particularly sensible, I think, when we want to create a society, a modern state, on the basis of a non-secularised Islam, a good solution could be that of the mystic (=God speaks now through my conscience, illuminated by Grace) but this does not solve social and administrative problems. Would you for instance be ready

to abolish banks? (They are a form of *riba*, and *riba* is legally proscribed).

These, however, are most general problems. For you Pakistanis, I find that your idea of a body of *Ulema* with state recognised theological diplomas and degrees would be a great improvement on present day mullahism, and if I were the President of Pakistan this would be the first law I should issue! Of course there are dangers also in this, because it is not easy to create in a short time good and modern theologians. A High Body of such theologians could be the "Authority" of which I spoke above: but will other countries recognise them? (Because in my opinion Islam should find a unifying form of "religious inspiration", which it lacks now and did not lack at the time of the Prophet and the first *Sahaba*, or the first *Imams*, for a *Shia*).

At page *34* when you speak of the freedom for non-Muslims to profess freely other religions, you are perfectly right in saying that this freedom practically always existed in Muslim countries. But here the "modern" conscience could propose you a very delicate problem: that of the *murtadd*. What would be the position of somebody who abandons Islam to become a Christian or a Buddhist, in a state administered strictly according to the *shari'a* laws? The religious Muslim conscience should say that this is a "going back" to more primitive forms of religion, and, therefore, should be prevented with rather strong laws and this I personally understand rather well, being, as I am, "half-Muslim" myself. (Professor Bausani is a Bhai by Faith.) But modern conscience is absolutely against any such discriminations.

I agree practically with almost all the rest. (At page *44*, it is true that Islam and the Qur'an introduced into the world forms of free government in theory, but historically considered Islam used in practice forms of medieval freedom which cannot be put on the same basis as modern parliamentary democracy).

For what concerns Communism I see that your judgement is rather hard. Though I am not at all a Communist, I would venture to say that we are still under the spell of the first reaction of Western "puritanical" and hypocrite Europe to the "bloodshed" of

Russian revolution. At page 142 you say that the Communists have no concern to teach about the literature, history, philosophy and religion of the past. This is perhaps the only sentence in your book which contains a factual mistake. In Russia plenty of books and specialised journals are published on those subjects, and we Italians could even say with shame that some old Latin writers were "commemorated" and exalted in USSR even with more eclat than in Italy itself! I would have still more emphasised the fact (at which you justly hint) that the fault of Communism is our fault. I always say that King Louis XVI of France and Tzar Nicholas II of Russia were not killed, but committed suicide, so foolish was their behaviour. (And when I say foolish I do not mean that they should have resisted more strongly to the new ideas, but rather that they should have adopted them. In the same way I say paradoxically that USA should have helped Mao Tse tung, not Chiang Kai Shek).

I hope that my frankness in discussing some delicate religious problems did not hurt you. I think, however, that for the present, the best solution for the future of Pakistan would be to adopt your proposals (especially that of the state recognised *Ulema*).

Annemarie Schimmel—(January 10, 1960)

I found a lot of interesting thoughts in this book—as well as some points which I want to criticise. Now let me tell you the remarks which I make are as an orientalist, an admirer of Iqbal, and a good friend of yours. Please do not mind some of my ideas; you know, I love your country, and I think it is my duty to tell you what seems to me dangerous in your statements.

I shall follow the order of the book:

p. 1. You quote here the Obligations of Faith after the principle of the Unity of God. We are used—not only in Europe but also in Turkey, and I think on good reasons, to define the five pillars of faith as: *kalimat ash shahada*, prayer, fasting, alms giving, and *Hajj*. I even remember a discussion with a pious Turk who asked me how the *kalimat ash shahada* could form one of the five pillars of faith, itself being the foundation of all of them. As to *the Holy war*, we used to learn that it was nearly becoming one of the pillars but has never been declared as such.

The idea of a democratic constitution as substitute of the *Khalifa* is good, and I do not think that one can object to it. I have often quoted in Turkey your father's views about the development in Turkey in this respect.

p. 5. The reinterpretation of legal principles in the light of contemporary experience is most important. In our faculty in Ankara we had a professorship for *Shari'a*, but I do not think that the students did learn anything there. And in the Faculty of Law in Ankara there was only a single course on *Shari'a*, therefore a Turkish judge or lawyer is completely helpless in *Shari'a* problems. But how to train the young jurists? We need, not only in Pakistan but all over the Islamic world, a responsible organisation which can lead the coming generations to such an interpretation. You have mentioned quite well that many problems of today's Pakistan have arisen from this two-fold law, and that the first condition for applying the constitution is the existence of well-trained jurists. (on *p. 20* of your book).

p. 11. The training of *Ulema* is indeed most important. You are right in saying that they have to be educated in Faculties or special schools. You know that Turkey has established since 1949 not less than 17 schools for *Imams* and *Khatibs* where youngsters between 14 and 17 are trained in the same classes as normal high school pupils, plus Arabic, Persian, and Islamic history and other Islamic subjects, including History of Religions. But the fact is that these schools are not acknowledged as institutions which can give maturity to the pupils, so that the absolvents are not allowed to go to the University, not even to the Faculty of Divinity from where their teachers are drawn. So we have to start in my old Faculty again with the elementary courses of Arabic etc., including pupils who have never read a single *Surah* of the Quran, whereas those pupils who know at least something about Islamics are forced to go to villages as preachers or *Imams*. I should propose that if you intend to train *Imams* and *Ulema* in Pakistan you should establish special training colleges for the pupils, and then send them, or at least the most intelligent ones, to the planned Faculty of Theology.

p. 13. I think you are a bit too harsh against mysticism. I know your father's attitude towards mysticism in its degenerated form, but

do not forget the great influence of Maulana Rumi on his thought. You must not forget that in every religion the ideal state is reached, when the constitutional, the rational, and the mystical elements are in perfect harmony. And though I have seen in Anatolia (even now) the most primitive forms of Sufi-craft which made me really ill, we must not deny that every religion has its innate mystic currents. Classical *tasavvuf*—before Ibn Arabi—is firmly rooted in the Quran and in the Sunnah of the Prophet, and it is the great virtue of Sufism that it has deepened the religious feelings, and the ethical striving of the people who were sighing under the dust-dry words of the *fuqaha*. Therefore, I think you must give some more room for mysticism in its best form. From your book one could get the impression that the proposed reformation of Islam, or its realisation in Pakistan, is to be done with outward forces, by a kind of state dirigism. I know that you do not want to say that, but a reader who is not aquainted with Iqbal's and your ideas could easily have this impression.

p. 15. In Germany the elected head of the state need not be a Christian, he can be a Jew, or even belong to any religion of the world, and I think that the case in France is the same. It is only in Protestant kingdoms like England and Sweden, where the monarch is *eo ipso* Head of the Church (a typical Lutheran invention by which the freedom from Rome was guaranteed but the Church often remained subject of political exploitation) and must be member of the official Church.

p. 18. You say that it is the Deed and not the Idea which makes a Muslim. What about the *niyaat*? You remember, the inscription of the Azhar University is *Al-a'amal-bil-Niyaat*. Ideas are sometimes more important than deeds.

p. 22. That no unlicensed person should preach, is a good suggestion. We have in Turkey also Preachers' examinations which contain not only Quranic and religious knowledge but also knowledge of sociology, geography etc. so that the preacher is aware of the present day needs and requirements.

p. 26. "The *Imams* should give sanction to the marriage tie". I do not know how marriage ceremonies in Pakistan are performed.

In Turkey only the marriage performed by the local authorities are accepted as legal, but since in many villages marriage registers etc. are non-existent, or a state employee is not easy to find, people use the *Imam Nikahi*, which means that he performs the ceremony. The Turkish Government has often tried to forbid this practice but nevertheless it continues, and the children of such marriages are mostly, after a while, delcared legal. Average and rich families often have a function with the *Imam* before the official wedding.

p. 27. That the *Imams* should be graduates of Theology (or at least, as I suggested, from special seminaries) is right. I also welcome the idea to train them in social work. Though I do not think that they should help in building houses etc. They could at least inform people how to do these things. And here another problem arises before me .You know that in Protestant countries social work, specially in the villages, is done by women, and very often by the wives of the ministers. The house of a Protestant minister is always a social centre of great importance. I am fully aware of the difficulties, but I think that a special duty would fall here on the wives of the *Imams* and preachers who could help the village girls, the families etc. in social and educational problems. We have even in our churches the profession of a special female helper for the minister who cares for children, old and sick people. I think that a similar institution—though completely new in Islamic countries—would have very useful results, and help people to develop a higher standard of life. You could have added in your book a whole chapter about the immense importance of women in social work which seems to me not in contrast with the ideals of Islam. Did not the first generation of Muslim women go out to the battle-fields and nurse the wounded? Remember Iqbal's elegy on Fatima!

p. 28. "Modern Islam cannot tolerate the presence of medieval mysticism"—perhaps not of medieval mysticism; but without mysticism it cannot live. No religion can. If you take mysticism as superstition then you are right, but if you take it as a living contact of the soul with the Divine Reality then you are wrong. And the History of Religions teaches us that the second definition is right. But we both know that people often slip to the dangerous side of this highest goal, and that they take secondary effects, like miracles as the goal.

p. 30. I think you have shown very clearly the duties of the state, especially those of realising equality of status and opportunity. The spirit of tolerance which is seen in this chapter, is very much to be appreciated. Indeed I personally found already in Pakistan a broader tolerance than in Turkey. I remember one day a certain street of Karachi was ornated with crosses and altars, and flags of "Christ is our saviour" etc., and nobody cared for it. In Turkey it would even now be impossible for a Christian sect to have such an open assembly without being disturbed. The stronger the faith, the wider the tolerance. Only those who feel insecure in their own faith will become fanatics.

p. 35. Compulsory instruction in the Quran is necessary in every school. But how can the state abolish customs under which large sums of money are wasted? That would lead to a very dangerous control system which may enable the state to interfere with the life of the people without being responsible.

p. 47. "The State....should guarantee the equality of all citizens before law". Do you intend here the normal law, or the *Shari'a*, or a modernised *Shari'a*? Since you know that according to the *Shari'a* the rights of a Christian subject are other than those of a Muslim, or those of a slave other than those of a free man, that women as witnesses must be two instead of one man etc. I suppose you do not mean the traditional *Shari'a*.

p. 48. That no person should be held in slavery is surely the ideal of Islam, but in the *Shari'a* the existence of slaves is accepted. What about polygamy? You do not touch this hot iron. I personally agree with the modernists that in polygamous marriages complete justice is required, and that this argument leads to monogamy. But how would you project this view to the masses or to those who are inclined towards polygamy?

p. 49. The passage about protection of non-Muslims is very fine and important. But the story related on the following page cannot be true, since Eastern Christianity never accompanied its services with instrumental music. It must have been "vocal music".

p. 63. It is true that the educational system must be reformed according to Islamic ideals. But can education alone produce leaders? The students can be trained and instructed to do their best, but the real leader is not created in schools, as Iqbal has remarked.

p. 68. Why "Urdu script which is similar to Persian or Arabic script"? Why not "Urdu, written in the Persian type (*ta'liq*) of Arabic script, with a few additional dots and signs". I agree with you that Persian script or Arabic script should be retained in Pakistan, and if it is possible to write Bengali in Arabic letters it would be a great help. I vote for Arabic script!

The chapter on Education is worth discussing. I agree with you that the study of History is very necessary. I found that the small booklet "History of Islam" by S. F. Mahmud is a good introduction for young people, and also for grown-ups who are interested in Islamic history. What you say on *p. 75* about Protestants and Catholics is not correct. No Protestant would think that Catholics belong to another Faith. The fact that they are believers in the incarnation and crucifixion unites them.

p. 79. The importance of Faculties of Bengali and Urdu, and on the other hand of the regional languages has been duly stressed. I agree with you that this is very necessary for Pakistan. I also consider the study of Turkish and Malayan as necessary in due course. Pakistan must work for the establishment of professorships of Urdu and Bengali at the universities in European and other Islamic countries. I personally would like to provide the children with some facilities in learning essential Arabic so that they could at least understand what they are reciting in their prayers. The *Hafiz* who does not understand the meanings of what he learns by heart must be replaced by a *Hafiz* who knows Arabic and can answer questions relating to theology.

p. 81. Your proposal of the Faculty of Theology is very similar to the Faculty in Ankara, only that in Ankara the study of the Quran is very weak. Add to the subjects: History of Islamic Art—so that the student knows the different types of mosques, the different kinds of scripts, etc. A course in reading of difficult manuscripts is neces-

sary, together with a thorough knowledge of Arabic, Persian, and if possible one European language besides English, at least a reading knowledge.

p. 82. The Faculty of Comparative Religions is a splendid idea, and I would love to help you in organising it. I think it could be combined with the Faculty of Theology so that the theologians may also attend these classes. The same is true also for the Islamic Research Centres. I do hope that these ideas are realised soon.

p. 88. You say "He believed in himself and his God"—that I must object. At least say: "He believed in his God and felt himself as His co-worker". The static pantheistic God is to be found only in some philosophers. As far as I am aware people have always felt the overwhelming *will* of God.

p. 90. Do you really believe in this statement of Nietzsche? I hope you do not. For 'peace of mind' is the highest gift which God can give to us and only by this inner peace we are able to work fruitfully in life.

p. 96. "*Even* God if approached with the instruments of logical reasoning would always appear to escape definition." Why "Even"? If God could be defined by man's logic He would cease to be God.

p. 115. Though you acknowledge the spiritual force of mysticism in earlier centuries, you think it has died since long—why? I am sure it is still alive, if only you happen to find the right people!

What you write of the relations of Pakistan and India, and about Communism seems to me to be quite correct. Respecting *p. 142*: Even in Communist countries history, literature etc. of the past are taught, and in these fields a lot of important books have been published in Russia. Of course these works try to show everything in the light of Marx's doctrines.

p. 149. The idea that the students should be trained in physical education and manual labour, is very dangerous. Do not ask how much we in Nazi Germany have suffered under principles like these.

We had to work six months in villages under bad conditions, and, since I was studying from 1939-41, we learned a lot there as they were nice people; but nobody gave back to me and my class-mates, the health we lost with these experiments. The war was on and so we had to do it. But never ever force young people to spend their precious time on these things. If they want to have sports, let them have what they want but do not force them to do manual labour. Let them rather work for their studies as that is much more useful for them. I say this because I have a long and unpleasant experience here. Just as you should not force a worker in a factory to spend his working hours in a University, so you should not force students to work in a factory and return home with rent hands. (I remember I often was unable, after 10 hours work in a telephone factory, to hold a pen, because my hands were full with blood from the sharp iron pieces). A state like yours must try to educate a real elite of scholars. This has nothing to do with equality. Everyone who does his best in his own field is equal to another.

p. 125. Who shall organise the Press, Radio etc? If the State does it, there is the danger that freedom of the Press will disappear. The same is true for the Arts in the Service of the Community. I understand what you want to say in these proposals, but since I have lived in a country where art and literature were organised by the State, where only those works which were thought to project the ideas of Nazi Germany were printed, where most precious books and masterpieces of art were burnt because they did not fit the Ideology of the State, I am very allergic to all such suggestions.

Freeland Abbott—(Islam and Pakistan Cornnell University Press, New York, 1968)

(Javid Iqbal) reflects an even more extreme modernist position than that taken by any of the individuals so far mentioned. (Abul Ala Maudoodi, Khalifa Abdul Hakim, Ghulam Ahmad Parvez). Javid Iqbal, a Lahore barrister and advocate in the High Court of West Pakistan, seems to represent the logical extension of the Muslim modernist movement in Pakistan. Syed Ahmad Khan, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and Ameer Ali, all represent the first stage of the Muslim response to the West, the stage of apologia; the second

stage, that of a serious re-evaluation of Islam in terms of a new age, is best represented by Sir Muhammad Iqbal; the third stage marked by a critical evaluation of the Muslim past—to end the escapist methods that have marked many Muslim scholars—may be indicated in Javid Iqbal. Muslims, he feels, have developed a penchant for a piecemeal approach to history; why, he asks, do they not recognise that they have been wrong?....Unless Muslims are willing to approach their history critically, he believes, they will be subject to increasing forces of disruption....Modern youth is revolting against the discipline of medieval Islam which, among other things, insists upon escapist analysis of history according to Javid Iqbal who sees the entire modernist movement in Islam in these terms....The romantic idea of Islam marked by medieval discipline, is no longer valid, he maintains....The revolt against discipline continues.... Maulana Maudoodi believes that Islam can be saved from a priesthood by making the study of Arabic compulsory—then everyone would be able to read the Quran authoritatively. Javid Iqbal poses an out-and-out modernist solution of this problem. 'Since each generation is to solve its own problems', he wrote, 'there is no reason why the power to interpret the law of Islam should not be given to the National Assembly.' Obviously, he continued, such a modern-day Muslim assembly would have little knowledge of the subtleties of Islamic law, but it would not matter if their instincts were healthy, and if—he quotes his father—they have 'the courage to rush into sun-lit space and do, even by force, what the new conditions of life demanded'....Javid Iqbal also proposes that if possibilities of erroneous interpretation seem still to exist, the study of Islamic law should be reformed in the light of modern jurisprudence. This would produce a group of lawyers trained to interpret Islamic law 'in the light of modern experience and the changed conditions of modern life'. With such lawyers sitting in the Assembly, the likelihood of erroneous interpretation would be greatly reduced. Obviously, he places little stock in the traditionalist argument that the longer one studies the religious books, and only the religious books, the more competent he is to interpret them. Javid Iqbal seems to view Islam very much as a nationalised church. The Government, through a Ministry of Religious Affairs, would own all the mosques in the country and appoint all the *Imams*, leaders in the mosques, who would be considered civil servants and receive a fixed salary, in somewhat the same manner as control was exerted in Revolu-

tionary France under the Civil Constitution of Clergy. A governmental licence would be required to lead congregational prayers or to preach in the mosques. Javid Iqbal believes that no hesitation should prevent making religion a vital organ of the state, because the religion and state are one. His juxta-position is interesting, for the traditionalists would have said that no hesitation should prevent the state from being a vital organ of the religion. In medieval Europe the disorganised Christian State eventually asserted itself over the organised Christian Church; in Pakistan an organised Islamic State is faced with a disorganised Islam....The nature of Islamic education in the modern world is one of the really decisive problems in Pakistan today....To resolve this situation Javid Iqbal proposes that all *Imams* not only be licensed by the government, but also be required to have degrees in theology from the state-recognised universities; and to be trained social workers as well. In time, under conditions such as these, the traditionalist scholar, the *Mujtahid*, would doubtless disappear....His emphasis, like that of almost every contemporary reformer, is basically social rather than religious. The attitude, incidentally, is to be found among such liberal sects in America today as the unitarian universalists. To expound on the nature of God, or to explain what God is thinking, is not as appealing a subject for discussion as it once was; if God is inscrutable and unknowable, then such discussion seems futile. The modernist, consequently, is left with man, and his approach to religion is largely ethical....This is as true for the advocate of liberal religion in the West as it is for the Muslim modernist. It is the route opened in Islam by Muhammad Iqbal through his new emphasis on the individual and his exposition of the Ideal Man. It is a route opened, too, by an emphasis on humanitarianism springing from more sources than Iqbal alone....The direction of the young Muslim modernist in Pakistan is frequently towards what might be called a liberal unitarian humanism.

K. G. Saiyidain—(April 30, 1960)

I have read your book with interest and though there are certain facets of your distinguished father's ideas with whose interpretation as given in the book I do not agree, you have certainly thrown very interesting light on some of the problems with which Pakistan is faced and the Ideology with which they should be approached.

I wrote 'Iqbal's Educational Philosophy' many years ago and since then I have been reading his works more or less continuously and his impact on my mind has been deepening in consequence. I have always been specially interested in working out their broad human implications which are applicable without distinction of creed or community. While he has a special message for the Muslims, I have sometimes the feeling that his deeper humanism has not yet been fully appreciated. If your writings can bring this aspect of his thought into prominence, you will be doing a very valuable service both to him and to your country.

Muhammad Ayub Khan—(July 11, 1959)

I have read the book with great interest. I congratulate you on producing this excellent document. My own mind is also working on the lines on which you have based your thesis. I entirely agree with you in your views on the script problem and the establishment of Islamic Research Centres at Lahore and Dacca. I am putting on the Ministry of Education to examine these suggestions closely and I am sure some good results will come out of it before long.

(October 9, 1959) On my request, many scholars and men of learning are applying their minds to these important questions. The thesis produced by Dr. Javid Iqbal is a brilliant effort and provides a rational and enlightened approach to some very fundamental problems.

Jawaharlal Nehru—(December 16, 1959)

I would certainly like to read your book, but the burden of work lies heavily upon me and prevents me from doing much reading. However, I have at present a bunch of books kept apart for reading. I shall add your book to that lot. I hope to have some time in the future to read it.

Terjumanul Quran—(Edited by Syed Abul Ala Maudoodi, January, 1960, Translation from Urdu)

The book under review is a very valuable contribution to a few serious writings which have appeared on the political future of

Pakistan ever since the imposition of Martial Law (1958)....The result of the perceptive analysis of the author is that if there is any Ideology which can guarantee the safety and welfare of Pakistan, it is Islam, because in both the wings of Pakistan, the people differ in colour, race, language and culture, and it is only Islam which can possibly bind them together....However, in our view, there are certain matters in this book which require reconsideration. First, whenever the author refers to the *Mullah* he mentions him in a contemptuous manner. But this fact ought to be borne in mind that it was the effort of these so-called 'religious fanatics' which kept the flame of Islam burning in the heart of Muslim masses during the period of subjugation. Second, we feel that the organisation of mosques etc. by the State, as suggested by the author, is fraught with many dangers. Undoubtedly such a policy might improve the lot of *Imams* of the Mosque materially, but it would virtually amount to the end of freedom of expression and would lead to the exploitation of this agency by the State for its own selfish ends; and third, the charge against Aurangzeb Alamgir that he imposed the law of Islam on the unwilling Hindus is also erroneous. There are few places where the interpretation of the Quranic verses may not strike as absolutely correct....But irrespective of these minor defects which can be easily removed, the book is worth reading, for it reflects the sincerity and honesty of purpose of the author.

Faran—(Edited by Maherul Qadri, April, 1960 Translation from Urdu)

The recommendations made by Dr. Javid Iqbal in this book regarding the Islamizing of laws are indeed very valuable and, trusting the sincerity of the author, even the suggestion about the formation of a Department of Religious Affairs is appropriate, though the mechanism recommended by him, in our view, conceals many dangers....We are inclined to think that it would be better if such matters are entrusted to semi-autonomous bodies instead of being totally under the control of the State through a Ministry of Religious Affairs. The object of the organisation of mosques etc. must be achieved by such a device that although mosques etc. should have the protection and be maintained by the material aid from the State, the organisation of such institutions must be completely free from State control....Anyway, the problem raised by the

author is extremely important and requires our serious attention.... One can disagree with some of the views expressed in the book, but the reader cannot help being impressed by the honesty of purpose, Islamic sentiment and seriousness of thought of the author.

The Muslim World—(Hartford USA July 1960)

The most pertinent attitude of the book is found in its affirmation that the declaration of an Islamic Republic is the declaration not of an accomplishment but of an aspiration (*pp. 17-18*), and that being a *Momin* is assumption of a responsibility and not of a boastful sense of achievement (*p. 18*).

The book denounces bigotry and calls the nation to tolerance and enlightenment. It urges that the history of "movement" and "change" in the tradition of Islam be emphasised more and more in the national curricula (*p. 72*) and that the modern history of Islam be given more attention than it has hitherto received (*p. 74*). It also favours the continued status of English in the country for many years to come (*p. 67*).

Likewise, it favours the vesting of authority in the judges of the Supreme Court of Pakistan to pronounce *fatwa* (verdict) on controversial religious issues (*p. 21*). It urges that jurists in Pakistan be equipped with thorough knowledge of Muslim *fiqh* (*p.6*).

Hearty congratulations are due to the author for a highly readable and well-meaning book.

The following brief comments are offered to stimulate greater interest in a book which is intended not for arm-chair enjoyment but to arouse the nation's concern over its future destiny.

The author cites (*p. 31*) Iqbal's view: "The essence of *Tawhid* as a working idea is equality, solidarity and freedom." We feel that this theological statement (cited again on *pp. 45, 48* and *56*) deserves some explanation without which it remains vague.

On *pp. 1* and *75* the author applies the phrase "structural principles" to the doctrines of Unity of God and Finality of Muhammad. The meaning of the phrase in this usage is not clear.

On *p. 85* the author affirms that Islam is a synthesis of the eastern and western outlooks on life. This statement needs elucidation.

The author is to be commended for urging tolerance and for citing instances of tolerant behaviour of Muslims toward non-Muslims (*pp. 49-50*). Here he is more thoughtful than on *p. 34* where he writes, ...“the Islamic State, in the past, has never interfered with or declared any of the institutions and customs of the non-Muslims null and void.”

It is humbly submitted that no community in this century should make such a presumptuous overstatement. No community, whether Christian or Muslim, is a community of angels.

On *p. 18* is to be found the statement: “It is Deed and not Idea which makes a Muslim.” This statement is perhaps valid but too brief. Its intent seems to be that professions which do not result in worthy deeds are empty and worthless. But equally important would be the statement that deeds which are not motivated by worthy ideas can be equally empty.

On *p. 90* is the following paragraph quoted from Nietzsche:

> “What would be the use of a God to whom anger, revenge, envy, sarcasm, cunning, violence, were unknown?....One would not understand such a deity; why should one have him? But when a race decays, when it feels its belief in the future, its hope of liberty finally vanishing; when submission appears to it as the most useful policy, and the virtues of the slave present themselves to the conscience of its members as a condition of existence, then must also the idea of God change. The God becomes nervous, fearful, humble, recommends the ‘peace of mind’, preaches against hatred, recommends cautiousness and ‘love’ both of friend and foe; he is perpetually moralising, he becomes everybody’s God, becomes a private gentleman, becomes a cosmopolitan.”

The author ought to have cited this caricature not with silent approbation but with some qualifying comment. Future students of world religions will demonstrate that the more lasting doctrine

is always the one of the God of tender and loving disposition. In Islam, the Qur'anic doctrine of God, the strict Judge, was obscured by Islamic theology within a century of its advent. The doctrine of a stern God may, in certain historical contexts, cause a lightning of political power. But lightnings are always shortlived. It can be argued powerfully that Islam owes its vigorous survival to a very early softening of the doctrine of God by the *Mutakallimin* and the *Sufis*.

The author voices a representative feeling when he decries the role of the ignorant *Mullah*. He firmly believes that the emergence of *Mullahism* in India is a result of the abolition of Qaza (*Qada*) in 1864 by the British, resulting in the inheriting of certain important functions of the Qadi by untrained priests (*p. 9*).

However, when he brackets *Sufism* with *Mullahism* as a paralysing force, here again he is speaking without due qualification of the statement. Degenerate *Sufism*, it is true, is to be decried. But nobler *Sufism* has been a great saving factor in Islam. It has provided the outlet to the inwardness by stressing the idea that not ritual but spirit is important. It is true that *Sufism* degenerated into grave worship and pantheistic non-personalism. But its contribution in checking hypocrisy is immense.

The author's downright condemnation of *Sufism* (*pp. 28* and *61*) needs some qualifying control.

Interesting and progressive view-points are offered by the book on the language question in Pakistan (*pp. 61, 67,* 70) on the training of *Imams* of mosques at seminaries (*pp. 11* and *27*) on the Institution of the Ministry of Religious Affairs (*pp. 25-27*) and so on. These discourses promise to stimulate thinking in Pakistan to the benefit of the nation.

NOTES

CHAPTER—1

1. Speeches, 1947-1948. p. 84.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 61.
3. *Ibid.*, pp. 44,45.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 58.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 8, 9.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 56.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 98.
8. Speeches and Writings ed. by Jamiluddin Ahmad. Vol. II. pp. 431, 432.
9. Speeches 1947-1948. p. 65.
10. *Ibid.*, pp. 153, 154.
11. Speeches and Writings ed. by Jamiluddin Ahmad. Vol. II. p. 89.
12. Speeches 1947-1948. p. 154.
13. Speeches and Writings ed. by Jamiluddin Ahmad. Vol. II. p. 431.
14. Speeches 1947-1948. p. 135.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 20.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 98.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 65.

CHAPTER—2

1. Rumuz-i-Bekhudi. pp. 195, 196.
2. Javid-nama. p. 6.
3. Asrar-i-Khudi. p. 5.
4. Payam-i-Mashriq. pp. 230-232.
5. *Ibid.*, pp. 236-238.
6. *Ibid.*, pp. 244, 245.
7. *Ibid.*, pp. 249, 250.
8. Bal-i-Jibril. p. 62.
9. Payam-i-Mashriq. pp. 255, 256.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 257, 258.
11. Bang-i-Dara. pp. 297, 298.
12. Guftar-i-Iqbal ed. by Muhammad Rafiq Afzal. pp. 5-8.
13. Bang-i-Dara. p. 334.
14. Zarb-i-Kalim. p. 138.
15. Thoughts and Reflections of Iqbal ed. by Syed Abdul Vahid. pp. 212, 213.
16. Bang-i-Dara. pp. 234, 235.
17. Thoughts and Reflections of Iqbal ed. by Syed Abdul Vahid. pp. 310-341.
18. Javid-nama. pp. 66, 67, 69, 70, 72, 73
19. *Ibid.*, pp. 80, 81.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 86.
21. *Ibid.*, pp. 87-92.
22. Pas che bayad Kard. pp. 21, 22.
23. Zarb-i-Kalim. pp. 60, 61.
24. Speeches and Writings of Iqbal ed. by Shamloo. pp. 164—169.
25. Bang-i-Dara. p. 212.
26. Bal-i-Jibril. p. 204.
27. Bang-i-Dara. p. 335.
28. *Ibid.*, pp. 276, 277.
29. Zarb-i-Kalim. pp. 120, 121.
30. Bal-i-Jibril. p. 179.
31. Zarb-i-Kalim. p. 104.
32. *Ibid.*, p. 125.
33. Iqbal-nama ed. by Sh. Ataullah. Vol. I., pp. 318, 319.
34. Armughan-i-Hijaz. pp. 223, 224.
35. *Ibid.*, pp. 225, 226.
36. *Ibid.*, pp. 227, 228.
37. Letters of Iqbal to Jinnah. pp. 14-18.
38. Modern Islam in India. p. 113.
39. Notes on Some Social Ideas contained in Iqbal's Javid-nama. pp. 239-243.

CHAPTER—3

1. 49; verse 13.
2. Muqqaddima. p. 220.
3. Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam. p. 154.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 168.
5. *Ibid.*, pp. 173, 174.
6. *Ibid.*, pp. 175, 176.
7. Islam and Ahmadism. pp. 31-33.
8. *Ibid.*, pp. 36, 37.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 40.
10. *Ibid.*, pp. 35, 36.
11. *Ibid.*, pp. 33, 34.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 32.

CHAPTER—4

1. 3; verse 189.
2. 2; verse 30.

3. Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam. pp. 174, 175.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 154.
5. 4; verse 1.
6. 4; verse 135.
7. 3; verse 180.
8. 2; verse 256.
9. 10; verse 100.
10. 49; verse 10.
11. 49; verse 13.
12. 3; verse 103.
13. 3; verse 104.
14. Islam in Modern History. pp. 15, 16.
15. 59; verse 23.
16. 18; verse 30.
17. 17; verse 15.
18. 53; verse 38-39.
19. 13; verse 11.
20. 42; verse 38.
21. 3; verse 159.
22. 4; verse 59.
23. 5; verse 2.

CHAPTER—5

1. 6; verse 152.
2. 2; verse 188.
3. 67; verse 15.
4. 22; verse 40.

CHAPTER—6

1. Quaid-i-Azam Speaks. p. 129.
2. Presidential Address. Allahabad. 1930. p. 7.
3. Letters of Iqbal to Jinnah. p. 17.
4. The Indian Annual Register. 1932. Vol. I., pp. 305, 306.
5. Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam. pp. 7, 8, 15, 97.
6. The Indian Annual Register. 1932. Vol. I. p. 306.
7. Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam. pp. 151, 152.
8. The Indian Annual Register. 1932. Vol. I., p. 306.
9. Quaid-i-Azam Speaks. p. 133.
10. Presidential Address. Pakistan Philosophical Congress. 1959. p. 19.
11. Islam in Modern History. pp. 292, 293.

CHAPTER—7

1. "Werke" viii. pp. 232, 233 quoted Chatterton—Hill: The Philosophy of Nietzsche. pp. 115, 116.
2. 23; verse 1-11.
3. 2; verse 177.
4. 24; verse 30.
5. 24; verse 27-28.
6. 33; verse 70.
7. 5; verse 8.
8. 49; verse 9-10.
9. 49; verse 12.
10. 49; verse 15.
11. 6; verse 152-153.
12. 17; verse 23-24.
13. 33; verse 58.
14. 49; verse 11.
15. 49; verse 12.
16. 107; verse 4-7.
17. 47; verse 7.
18. 58; verse 22.
19. 49; verse 14.
20. 2; verse 190.
21. 4; verse 104.
22. 4; verse 74.
23. Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam. pp. 72, 73.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 10.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 180.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 93.
27. Iqbal's Educational Philosophy. pp. 42, 43.

CHAPTER—8

1. Presidential Address. Allahabad. 1930. p. 6.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 6.
3. Kitabul Hind trans. by E. Sachau. Vol. I. p. 17.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 179.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 19.
6. Speeches and Writings ed. by Jamiluddin Ahmad. Vol. I. pp. 178, 253.
7. Enlist India for Freedom. pp. 58, 59, 62.
8. Presidential Address. Allahabad. 1930. pp. 7, 8, 15.
9. Speeches and Writings ed. by Jamiluddin Ahmad. Vol. I. p. 254.

CHAPTER—9

1. The Dawn. 9th March, 1951.
2. The New York Times. 11th December, 1955.
3. Unwilling Journey (A Diary from Russia). p. 142.
4. Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam. pp. 187, 188.

INDEX

REPRINTED BY
NATIONAL BOOK FOUNDATION
OF PAKISTAN